



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015

No. 98

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God our Father, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of the people's House as they gather at the end of another week in the Capitol. Endow each with the graces needed to attend to the issues of the day with wisdom, that the results of their efforts might benefit the citizens of our Nation and the world.

We also ask Your blessing leading into this weekend upon fathers throughout our country. May they be their best selves, and may their children appreciate fully the blessing their fathers have been to them.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANCE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### FEDERAL OBSTACLES TO SAVING FOR RETIREMENT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot in this Chamber about the negative impacts of overly burdensome rules and regulations handed down by bureaucrats in Washington.

Nowhere are the potential negative consequences more evident than the 700-page rule proposed by the Department of Labor. Among other things, it expands the Department's complex pension rules to cover IRAs as well as changes the definition of who is classified as a financial adviser. Ultimately, I believe this rule will restrict access to advice and drive up costs for small businesses.

It also illustrates a fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats. Democrats want everyone to end up in the same place with identical outcomes, and Republicans believe in providing individuals with the same level of opportunity. This rule

seeks guaranteed outcomes for everyone, but there are inherent risks associated with investing.

While I am open to modernizing current rules in order to protect consumers against predatory practices that pose unnecessary risks, I will not support efforts that make it harder for American families to save and plan for retirement.

### HONORING J.C. KILMER

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, Tom Brokaw once said:

It's easy to make a buck. It's much harder to make a difference.

Today I rise to honor someone who made a difference as a schoolteacher for 50 years. He began his career a half century ago at Roosevelt Junior High School in Port Angeles, Washington, where he taught seventh grade home-room and coached football.

I have met so many people who had him as a teacher; I think he may have taught my entire hometown. But the common themes from his former students that I have met have been these: He was a great teacher. He cared about me as a student. He didn't just teach me English and geography; he taught me to be a better student and a better person.

Earlier this week, he finished out his career at the Chrysalis School in Woodinville, Washington, and yesterday he had his first well-deserved day of retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the teacher that I rise to honor today is named J.C. Kilmer, and he is my dad.

Mark Twain remarked that the two most important days in a person's life are the day he is born and the day he figures out why. My father was born to teach. And like so many fantastic educators, he has affected so many lives in so many ways.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4495

So today I hope you will join me in thanking a teacher. I want to congratulate him for being a great educator, a difference maker, and a terrific dad.

Happy retirement, Dad.

#### REPEALING THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of repealing the medical device tax, a burdensome tax on medical devices that increases costs, stifles investment, slows the race for cures, and ultimately makes health care more expensive for patients.

The tax has resulted in less spending on research and development, escalating costs on the newest technologies, a reduction in capital investments, and, ultimately, is a factor in the loss of jobs in our Nation's vital life science sector, which is critical to keeping the United States a leader in the world and is crucial to my home State of New Jersey.

One of the major newspapers in our area editorialized recently in support of our efforts, the Easton Express-Times, pointing out that the medical device tax is having a depressing effect on a sector of the economy that until recently was doing well. Some are looking to relocate overseas.

I thank my close friend, Congressman ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota, and the Ways and Means Committee for sponsoring this legislation. I urge the House to pass repeal of the medical device tax and work with our Senate colleagues to send this measure to the President.

#### GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the night before last, with the whole world watching, my home team, the Golden State Warriors, brought the O'Brien Trophy back to Oakland.

The Warriors, led by NBA MVP Stephen Curry, showed the power of persistence and teamwork both on and off the court.

The finals against the well-matched and talented Cleveland Cavaliers were a thrill to watch. These games were basketball at its best, with both teams showing real passion on the court.

It has been 40 years since Oakland last brought home the championship, and throughout this long journey, Warrior fans have stayed loyal and faithful.

Thank you to the Warriors team for making our dreams of another championship a reality. I have no doubt that this remarkable team will go down in Oakland's history. Thank you to head coach Steve Kerr, Stephen Curry, Clay

Thompson, finals MVP Andre Iguodala, and all of the talented players who brought this championship home.

I can't wait to celebrate this win with all the Warriors fans and players at the victory parade tomorrow morning in Oakland.

Go Warriors. Go Oakland. Go Dub Nation.

#### IN HONOR AND MEMORY OF CLEMENTA PINCKNEY

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor and memory of my former South Carolina General Assembly colleague, State Senator Clementa Pinckney.

Tragedy shot through the hearts of every family and community last night in South Carolina. It is important in times like these to remember that we are all made in the image of God. We are all brothers and sisters in Christ and are there to shoulder the burden of tragedy and loss.

Please pray for the 180-year-old Emanuel AME Church, who suffered the loss; the city of Charleston, tormented with distress; the State of South Carolina and its law enforcement personnel. We all need to come together with compassion and love.

Remember from the Book of Matthew:

Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted.

Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the Earth.

Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied.

Blessed are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy.

Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.

Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

May God comfort the city of Charleston and the State of South Carolina this morning.

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight the familiar predicament Congress has found itself in because the Republican leadership continues to govern by crisis.

As of today, we have only 4 legislative days until the Export-Import Bank expires. This bank helps American businesses of all sizes and markets around the world.

China's businesses have the support of their country's export-import bank, and we need to give our businesses the same certainty.

For years, the Ex-Im Bank has helped level the playing field for busi-

nesses in my district and across this Nation, empowering and supporting them to grow and conduct business overseas.

I have had the opportunity to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support businesses and create jobs in my home district in San Bernardino County.

There is no reason we can't continue working together to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank so American workers and businesses have the opportunity to play a role in the global economy.

We cannot force American businesses and workers to pay the price for Congress' inaction. The Ex-Im Bank doesn't cost taxpayers a cent and has created or maintained 1½ million private sector jobs since 2007. We need to stop the political games and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

#### PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the 21st century workplace where women account for nearly half of the workforce, it is vital that our policies reflect today's new realities. Specifically, the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act, PDA, is in need of modernization.

Recently, the act was litigated before the Supreme Court, but even the Justices were unable to fully resolve how to apply the PDA. That is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I have introduced the Pregnancy Discrimination Amendment Act. It says working moms-to-be should have access to reasonable accommodations from their employers if health issues arise from pregnancy.

Unlike other proposals that will create more mandates, confusion, and litigation, my bill simply clarifies existing law to ensure the 21st century workplace works for families, employers, and expectant mothers.

#### IRAN

(Mr. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we approach the deadline of negotiations with Iran to stress that any agreement must unequivocally guarantee that Iran cannot obtain nuclear weapons.

While a diplomatic solution is the ideal method of stopping Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program, we owe it to the American people of this country to end up with not just a good deal, but a great deal.

A great deal means giving inspectors robust access to nuclear facilities to promptly verify compliance. A great deal means Iran acknowledges the full extent of its nuclear weapons program. A great deal would remove tools that

could leave Iran with a pathway toward nuclear weapons and provide a long-term solution. Finally, a great deal phases in sanctions relief so we aren't rewarding Iran for deception and noncompliance.

A nuclear Iran is one of the greatest threats to the United States; our greatest ally, Israel; and to regional stability in the Middle East. I cannot stress enough how important it is that Iran must not, under any circumstance, be able to obtain a nuclear weapon.

#### COMMEMORATING AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again rise to join in commemorating June 20, 2015, as American Eagle Day and celebrate the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

On June 20, 1782, the eagle was designated as a national emblem of the United States by the Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress. The bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States and is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government.

The bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and democracy of the United States. Since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the eagle have played a significant role in art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and the culture of the U.S. The bald eagle's habitat only exists in North America.

I hope my colleagues will join in celebrating June 20, 2015, as American Eagle Day, which marks the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle.

□ 0915

#### INTERNATIONAL YOGA DAY

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution to commemorate the first ever International Yoga Day.

This day is occurring on Sunday, June 21, and it was a day that was designated by the United Nations with over 177 countries in support. Over 24 million Americans and 250 million people around the world practice some form of yoga, and, on Sunday, people all around the world will be celebrating the benefits of living a yoga lifestyle.

India's Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, addressed the UN General Assembly on September 27, 2014, stating:

Yoga is an invaluable gift of India's ancient tradition. It embodies unity of mind and body, thought and action, restraint and

fulfillment, harmony between man and nature, a holistic approach to health and well-being. It is not about exercise, but, rather, it is about discovering the sense of oneness within yourself, the world, and nature.

As a longtime yoga practitioner myself, I have experienced firsthand the positive impact of yoga on my own life, and I am honored to be introducing this resolution today and sharing with others the true meaning of yoga.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2146, DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIRE- MENT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 321 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 321

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 321.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same Act.

House Resolution 321 states that it "shall be in order . . . to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion . . . that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution."

Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to section 426 that this resolution may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentlewoman from New York makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from New York and a

Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to take a moment, if I may, to mourn the horrific loss of life in Charleston, South Carolina.

Places of worship used to be places of sanctuary, but there are no more sanctuaries in the United States from gun violence. Whether it is an elementary school, a college, a hospital—anywhere in the world—gun violence is there among us. We want to all give our condolences to our colleague JIM CLYBURN, who represents that area in Charleston.

I have a personal interest in it as a very good friend of mine, who had been pastor of Baber AME Church for decades in Rochester, left us to go to pastor that church and is still an elder there. So our hearts go out to all of them for all of the grief. We hope that we will see brighter days when people can go to a sanctuary place of worship in peace.

Now to the matter before Congress today, Mr. Speaker, our Chamber and our Nation are off balance. There is something drastically wrong when Members of the people's House are asked to vote on greasing the skids for a trade deal they are discouraged from reading and, even if they do read, cannot discuss with their constituents, the people who sent them here.

That is what we are being asked to do today regarding a massive trade deal: abdicate our authority by approving fast track and to give the simple vote of "yea" or "nay" on an issue that is not simple at all. In fact, it could not be more complex or more far-reaching. Unlike the Senate action on this measure, Members of the House were totally unable to have any amendment or very much discussion of what is going on here.

Mr. Speaker, fast track is an anachronism that needs to die. There is no longer any need for it at all. It came as a matter of convenience in the seventies when the United States was the biggest manufacturer on the face of the Earth and when we were pretty sure we always would be. So it was decided by the powers that were in place then that the Congress would just hand it over to the administration to go ahead and negotiate whole trade agreements despite the fact that the Constitution of the United States gives us that power. We allowed the administration to do it. One committee, Ways and Means, got to see it. There was no amendment, and the only vote we can take on a trade bill is "yea" or "nay."

Mr. Speaker, it is not just we who are forbidden, basically, to see what is in this bill and to talk about it. It is also the countries of Australia and New Zealand. Let me read from a report on that.

They are very much concerned there with the fact that this TPP—what they had found leaked out, that what PhRMA is doing here is to extend all of their patents for 12 years so that they can not only raise those prices here in this country but for all of those countries involved in the trade agreement.

Jane Kelsey, who is on the faculty of law of the University of Auckland, described what was happening here as one of the most controversial parts—that is, the pharmaceutical part—because the U.S. pharmaceutical industry used a trade agreement to target New Zealand's Pharmaceutical Management Agency, PHARMAC, which is their health system.

This transparency act will erode the process and decisions of agencies that decide which medicines and medical devices to subsidize with public money and by how much. The leaked test shows that TPP will severely erode PHARMAC's ability to continue to deliver affordable medicines and medical devices as it has for two decades.

The parliamentarians in Australia and New Zealand are under the same restriction as we are, only theirs is even worse. A member of that Parliament who goes to read the trade agreement has to sign a paper that he will not discuss it for 4 years.

I make this point because two of the great democracies on this planet—the United States of America and Australia—have given over the right of the people's elected Representatives to know what is in these trade deals that will have such devastating effects on all of the people they represent. How in the world can this continue, and how can we let it go on?

If we don't do anything in this Congress—and we may not—I would really like to see us do away with the whole idea of fast track. We can't afford it any longer. At least I am sure, when it began, there was no problem with certain corporations deciding that they were going to make the main decisions as we have had made known by leaks here. I have not gone to read the bill. I do not want to be hamstrung by anything that I can discuss and concerns that I have with the people whom I serve. This is one of many reasons, I think, this trade bill is bad.

Let me say I have a few more here that I would like to go over, and I need to make sure that everybody understands this. When you vote for TPA today, you are voting for things that were in that Customs bill. Again, hardly any of us knew anything about it.

Let me just tell you what they are:

Preventing action on climate change. This is going to be written in this bill. Nobody anywhere can even bring up climate change. It is a great step backward, and they managed to get this in, and the Pope is in sync, too. That is very interesting.

Secondly and most grievous to many of us who have worked so hard on human trafficking, including Members on both sides of this House with whom

I have worked, it weakens the language on human trafficking. They had to do that because the nation with the worst standards on human rights and human trafficking is Malaysia, which is one of the countries with whom we want to be allied.

Third, they ignore currency manipulation, which we have been told for a decade or more is one of the most serious acts against the United States from countries that trade with us, which is changing their currency. As one of my colleagues has pointed out, Mrs. DINGELL, one automobile company made more money from its trade manipulation than it did by selling its cars. We don't want to expand that. We don't want that to go on.

There is also a strong anti-immigration provision that we are being asked to vote on today, and we won't do that—giving up our rights as the elected Representatives of the people of the United States. It says that trade agreements do nothing to address the immigration. They may not.

Then Democratic priorities, such as ensuring that Dodd-Frank would not be affected by the trade agreement, because we have heard that financial services is very heavily involved here, were rejected in the Senate and were not included in this bill. We are very much concerned about that.

We are very much concerned about where we are going, but the fast-track deal will be an absolute rubber stamp to disaster.

As I mentioned before, it has been negotiated in a cloud of secrecy by multinational conglomerates and the financial services industry and pharmaceutical companies that have one priority, and that is the bottom line. What we know, again, is all we have heard from leaks. Not a lot has made its way to the light of day, but what has has been appalling, and it does certainly give anyone who wants to vote pause to think about what that vote means before he gives it, because we don't know what is in that bill.

One of the things that some of us are very much concerned about is food safety and prescription drugs, the erosion of environmental protections, and the degradation of the financial sector. This deal is headed down the wrong path. Not only would the TPP certainly ship good-paying American jobs overseas, but it would endanger the food on our tables by weakening the safety standards. Ninety percent of the seafood consumed in America is imported, but only 1 to 2 percent is inspected, much of it from countries with little controls on sanitation and water quality that American consumers expect.

One of the biggest threats comes from shrimp imported from Vietnam, a TPP partner. The dangerous bacteria in Vietnamese shrimp is really ubiquitous and has included shrimp contaminated with MRSA, which is fatal, and drug-resistant salmonella. What is more, the TPP report includes due def-

erential preference to rules negotiated by drug companies extending their patents, as I have said, in an unfair way for 12 years. They are rigging the system in a way that would make it harder for people in TPP countries to have access to life-saving drugs.

Now, we have got a history to warn us about this. This thing has been modeled after NAFTA, which cost us over 5 million jobs. My part of the country is just now recovering from NAFTA a little bit, and we don't want to see this happen again. All over this country, there are factories that are closed and cities that are gone—places where there, literally, is no work.

Even doing TAA, which is very important to us, would be training people for jobs, in most cases, that don't even exist; but this has been hidden away from the American people and certainly has been hidden away from the Congress, the people who represent them. It is causing a stir all the way around the world. As I pointed out, other countries are looking at this with great interest.

Let's follow what our minority leader said last week. Let's put this thing to rest and negotiate openly a trade agreement that we can be proud of. We all believe in trade. Everybody talks about free trade. I want to change that now to fair trade that will be enforceable and that will benefit everybody involved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise with a sad heart regarding the occurrences and the things which happened in South Carolina last night. I know, I join the gentlewoman as well as all the Members of this body to express our condolences and our sorrow with the things that have happened. I know that later in the day we will take time to offer those formally by the members of the South Carolina delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is, should the House now consider House Resolution 321. That is what we are here for. While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the motion to concur with the amendment, the committee is not aware of any violations of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This is simply a dilatory tactic that the gentlewoman wants to use to talk further about the issue at hand. I get that.

We have spent weeks talking about this. The United States Senate spent weeks talking about this issue. The gentlewoman wanted to use her time to talk about all the things that she believes are wrong with the bill, and that is okay. That really doesn't bother me.

But the bottom line to the entire matter is that we are using our responsibility under the Constitution for the Congress of the United States to establish the laws and to direct the President of the United States that we believe is very constitutional to say to the President of the United States, we want you to go engage the world in a trade deal, and we are going to tell you the parameters, some 160 different parameters about how we believe you should engage the foreign countries in these trade deals.

The gentlewoman is right, there are some difficult piece parts in there, as the gentlewoman mentions about immigration. Yes, I made sure that was in there because I don't believe this should be about immigration or visas. I believe this should be about trade. And, yes, there is language that is in there about climate change because I don't believe this should be about the United States in a political circumstance trying to push our ideas on a trade deal about global warming or these considerations that might be related to that issue.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is right, there are piece parts of this agreement, the trade promotion authority, that not everybody likes, but let's not act like you didn't have an opportunity to read the bill or understand the bill. But much like any contract—and that is what we are engaging here in. We are engaging in saying to the President, we want you to go sign a contract, an agreement with these foreign countries that are in the Far East who have not only large populations, but growing economic circumstances to buy our products, and us to make sure that we lower tariffs or taxes on those products to where they are available to us.

Yes, we understand currency manipulation is a problem, and primarily that is a problem with perhaps two countries. Neither of those countries do we have a free trade agreement with, and one of them we want to have a free trade agreement with. Another country simply, I don't believe, understands rule of law or intellectual property, and I think they are thugs and don't care. They are a country that steals openly hundreds of billions of dollars from the United States, and they do not respect any rule of law or international agreements. So we probably won't sign an agreement with them.

But this is a good deal. It is a good deal. The last 10, 20 countries that America has had a trade agreement with, we have a \$10 billion surplus with those countries because those countries want American products, because the American worker does a great job, and we have the best engineering and manufacturing and pricing, but the product is worthy in the world market and will sell.

The State of Texas, which I am from, sells \$289 billion of Texas-made products overseas every year. That is an example of how important trade is.

This trade deal contract that we are wanting to empower the President—whoever that may be for the next 7 years—is to say let's go out a deal that is good to that country and to America. In the process, Mr. Speaker, we added some language for those of our friends that are watching along with you, Mr. Speaker, as I address my comments to you.

Section 8, subsection A on page 101 says:

United States law to prevail in event of conflict.

Mr. Speaker, it lays it out right here:

No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 3(b) nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality in the United States shall have effect.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to suggest to you is, there are a lot of things about this bill; some that some people like, some things that others don't like. But we had a chance to read it; we had a chance to understand it. This is a contract that we have not even agreed to yet. Why would someone go and publicly talk about a deal that they haven't made?

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what is happening right now is that we should say that this point of order should not prevail. I think that what we should do is move to the direct discussion that we are going to have to allow the House to continue its business, and I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question under consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry: In the underlying bill, is there anything to prevent taxpayers from having to pay out hundreds of millions of dollars for the privilege of enforcing the very laws that the gentleman from Texas says this agreement would preserve, any local ordinance, any State agreement like happened in Canada recently, that the taxpayers end up having to pay the bill for simply enforcing existing law?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. I urge a "yes" vote. I reserve the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I need to inquire from you, if my colleague was reading from the trade bill, what he had read and is forbidden to speak about. It is

classified, you know. Did he reveal classified information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry. Now, if the gentlewoman has a parliamentary inquiry, please state it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. My concern is that he is reading from a classified document. I need to know if that is the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Section 8 of the TPA. I did not say TPP.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have pretty well beaten this dead donkey to its point. Its logical conclusion is we now move forward. I urge a "yes" vote on the question of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I believe that our comments this morning should be tempered with a reminder about the events of South Carolina and how much this body and its Members offer their prayers and consideration not only of our colleagues but all the people of South Carolina, the men and women, law enforcement, and people of faith all across this country. I want to, once again, express my consideration of those ideas.

Mr. Speaker, before I go through my opening statement, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Irvine, California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent considerable time debating the merits of TPA in this body. I want to bring us back to the fundamentals of this debate. I want to talk about why trade is so important to our economy, why trade is a conservative cause, and why trade is so vital to our Nation. Simply put, free trade empowers the individual to make decisions in his or her best interest without undue government influence.

Look around at your house or at your car. Without question, there are imported products. Free trade allows you, as an individual, to make the best economic choice for your family. When economic enterprise is free from unnecessary government interference and all enterprise is treated equally, the most competitive actors will rise to the top.

That means higher quality products and lower prices, which translates to improved standards of living and economic growth.

Opponents of free trade will say we need protectionist measures to maintain certain industries, but that is a flawed argument. Protectionist measures may benefit a few in select industries, but ultimately protectionism is more harmful to the Nation's economic health. Protected industries become inefficient. Consumers are denied choice, and American businesses face retaliatory trade measures overseas. Bottom line, protectionism is an abandonment of the free market in favor of government intervention.

I believe that when American businesses and entrepreneurs are placed on an equal playing field, when we eliminate tariffs and protectionist barriers at home and abroad, American businesses can compete and win against any of their foreign competitors. The famed economist Milton Friedman said: Free trade ultimately forces competitors to put up or shut up.

Mr. Speaker, let us set the table for free trade. Let us pass TPA. I know American businesses will put up.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has been so effective on this bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this fast-track bill, which is only made worse by a gimmick of it being attached to unrelated legislation designed to help Federal public safety professionals. I might add, as has already been mentioned, the general president of the International Association of Firefighters, which this rule addresses as well, has said: We urge you to oppose this rule.

For 20 years, our Nation's trade policy has been failing American workers and the businesses that want to invest in this country. It has driven away jobs, pushed down wages, and exacerbated inequality. A vote for fast track is a vote to continue that bad trade policy for another generation because if we approve fast track today, we rubberstamp the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership asks American workers to compete with labor in developing countries like Vietnam, where the minimum wage is 56 cents an hour. It does nothing to combat the biggest source of lost jobs—currency manipulation—which The Economist's Fred Burksen has said has cost us in the United States up to 5 million jobs. People lost their jobs and lost their livelihoods. It allows thousands

of foreign corporations to challenge U.S. laws on food safety, drug safety, environmental protection, health care, labor rights, the minimum wage, and, indeed, any domestic law on any subject.

□ 0945

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle said that that is not the case. Just witness what happened last week when the majority in this body voted to repeal country of origin labeling so that we know where our meat, our poultry, and our pork comes from because the World Trade Organization and Canada and Mexico ruled against us. So we are going to give up our domestic law.

This is a trade agreement that has been crafted by lobbyists for the special interests and industries that stand to gain the most by weakening U.S. regulation and shipping jobs overseas, yet the administration has shown absolutely no interest in improving this deal or even listening to our concerns. That means that when the Trans-Pacific Partnership comes to this House, we need the ability to amend it. At the very least, it must include sanctions against currency manipulation, enforceable labor, environmental standards, and include a transparent process.

If we vote for fast track today, we throw away our ability to make any of those amendments, and we turn our backs on our commitment to American workers: to their jobs, to their families, and to their economic security.

We must make this a vote, and this vote must be a turning point so that at long last the American public can say that those of us in this House opposing fast track demand policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. The vote last Friday and today's vote are critical in letting the American public know where we stand and that, in fact, we prioritize their economic security, their jobs, their increased wages and that we are opposed to special interests. And that is what this Trans-Pacific Partnership is all about.

We must reject this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of confusion down here. Everybody thinks we are now talking about ObamaCare, and we are not.

The gentlewoman talked about diminishing wages, diminishing job opportunities for the future, diminishing opportunities for American workers to have higher wages. There is no bill that I have ever seen that diminished wages or people's opportunity to work the hours that they would like to work more than ObamaCare. But we are not debating that today.

Mr. Speaker, we are here—and I want to be clear—about trade promotion au-

thority, TPA—not TPP, not any of the other bills. We are here for TPA today, exactly the same bill that this House passed last week. That is what we are here for.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Sunnyside, Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying trade promotion authority bill.

Look at my State of Washington. We have jobs, economic growth, and increased exports because of trade. Those benefits and the example of that can be applied to our entire Nation.

By passing TPA, Congress will set priorities to ensure that any agreement levels the playing field with our trading partners and creates jobs here at home. Without it, the administration will be setting those priorities, and we, Congress, will have no say and little oversight.

In my State, we export coffee, many agricultural products, aircraft, footwear, and software. We export, fully, 30 percent of our apples, 60 percent of our hops, and over 85 percent of our wheat.

TPA is about instructing our trade negotiators to reduce the trade barriers that American farmers and manufacturers face so that we can create and sell openly around the world.

Right now, our American wines face very stiff tariffs in Japan, but Chilean and Argentinean wines face none. Our beef faces a 38 percent tariff; oranges, 16 percent. TPA will instruct our trade negotiators to work on lowering these tariffs.

The reason to vote on TPA and why it is so important is that it will make the deal public and give the American people several months to review any negotiated deal. Without passing this, there is no review period. The deal can stay secret.

Some have objected that their voices have not been heard on this matter, but for months, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Rules Committee have considered dozens of amendments to three different trade-related bills. There has been ample time for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill are critical to our economy. Without it, our country will continue to face enormous barriers; but with it, we can grow our businesses, create more jobs, and ensure the American economy remains the most competitive and strongest in the world for decades to come.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The administration seems to think the Democrats and the coalition that is opposing the TPP would reject any trade deal. We are called protectionists. We are called unreasonable. But that is not true. Rather than these fancy parliamentary manipulations, we should take the time now to fix it.

Some of the most odious positions that we know that are in the TPP which this fast track will speed us to are U.S. negotiating positions. Our trading partners are not clamoring for the extrajudicial investor dispute resolution authority, allowing huge corporations to challenge their hard-fought consumer protections, worker and environmental laws, et cetera. These are our negotiating positions. We could drop them and that would be welcomed abroad among our trading partners.

Countries want the opportunity and the right to protect their food supplies—and that includes us. Decrease smoking; promote Buy America; increase the minimum wage; control the cost of drugs; protect our environment. We could reset the balance of the intellectual property rights and access to lifesaving, affordable medicines by rewriting the pharmaceutical chapter, which I did look at.

More than a trade bill, this establishes a new regulatory regime that favors the wealthiest and the most powerful corporations. We could change that.

These votes we are taking today are not the end of the track. It is beginning the track to a new negotiation. It is the beginning of an opportunity for us to sit down and make sure that we get the best for workers, consumers, and our trading partners, and that we benefit our economy not just for the very few at the top that can go to some extrajudicial court and challenge our regulations, but for everyone. This is a bill that we can make better.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman knows that in the TPA agreement there is an agreement that she can go and attend every single round of the discussions and negotiation, by law. She can be right there. She can watch it as it happens. We can be engaged in this, as Members of Congress, the entire way. That is what this agreement is about. This is about TPA, not TPP.

The fear factor, Mr. Speaker, is incredible. Let's go and do the right thing for the American worker and our future. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Raleigh, North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Here we go again, Mr. Speaker, debating what should be the United States' future role in the global economy.

We have heard a lot over the past few months about the economic benefits associated with free and fair trade, but trade is just as important to our Nation's foreign policy as it is to our bottom line. There is no question that trade is an important, strategic soft-power tool.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think for one second China isn't watching this very debate right now, waiting to see how serious we, the Congress, are about America's economic future and commitment to retaining our position of global leadership. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to guess they have been focused on what a deal like the TPP would mean for their sitting and future ambitions in the Asia Pacific region for a long time now.

The United States can either be in a position where we can write the rules for the future trade agreements and develop closer bilateral ties with our negotiating partners, or we can sit on the sidelines.

Passing TPA is about expanding our influence in a critical region of the world with the TPP and solidifying our alliances with our partners in Europe with the TTIP. Failing to pass TPA, I fear, will confirm many of our allies' own fears that America is in retreat from the global stage.

But we can send a strong signal today, Mr. Speaker, that while our Nation's foreign policy has recently been adrift, the House of Representatives—and the United States—supports closer economic ties with our partners and wants to see an America that is engaged on the world stage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule and support for the TPA legislation later today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. It is such a danger, Mr. Speaker, that the majority is trying to move through the back door what it could not get through the front door on the floor of this House last week. And they are doing it in the most shameful way, Mr. Speaker: hiding behind our first responders. That is right; hiding behind firefighters and emergency personnel.

The International Association of Firefighters, representing more than 300,000 firefighters and emergency room personnel, oppose what is being done here today on this floor, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

There is one thing that I agree with the gentleman from Texas about. This is a donkey that died last week when we stood up for American workers, small businesses, and American jobs. And right now that donkey is like roadkill, and we are going to kill it right here on the floor of this House of Representatives.

We know that this body can pass legislation that in fact is not just about free trade, but is about free trade—and they are not doing it today—protecting our workers, protecting our climate, protecting our Buy America provisions for our procurement.

And so, Mr. Speaker, even as we are just getting word of the Pope's encyclical on climate change and overwhelmingly recognizing the human

cost to us all, we have a letter from our U.S. Trade Representative, Michael Froman, saying that this deal doesn't do anything to deal with the authority of the administration to negotiate climate change. That, in fact, is shameful. And what we are doing here today is against American workers, against American businesses, and against American jobs.

It is time to kill this donkey once and for all by putting it to rest and coming back to the table to reset for the American workers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), one of the most exciting new Members of Congress from the Ways and Means Committee. I have visited and watched this young man as he not only ably represents a proud group of people, but is a strong American.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in this House, we have a duty to legislate based on truth, not fiction. We cannot afford to be uneducated, uninformed, or untruthful when it comes to PTA. Maybe the problem is we labeled it wrong. Maybe we should have called it "Congressional Trade Authority Oversight." Maybe that is what we should have called it.

There is a great misunderstanding—and I hope it is a misunderstanding—about what this does for us. There is no way America can compete in the global economy without strong trade agreements. When Congress sets the parameters and very carefully constructs what the agreement has to contain, there is no mystery, there is no bogeyman, there is nobody hiding under the bed, there is nobody hiding in the closet. You don't have to have a secret decoder ring. You don't have to have some magical knock at the door to read all these different items. It is there for you to look at.

For crying out loud, will you stop pushing a false narrative if it is about growing our economy? The only way we can grow is protecting what we have and then going into the global economy and increasing our market penetration. It is that simple.

If you want America to grow, then you must allow America to grow. And you must allow America to lead, because when America leads, America wins. And when America wins, the rest of the world wins. It is just that simple.

Why in the world fast track? It is not fast track. If you want to call it slow track, that is fine, because you are going to have 60 days to read it. That is pretty slow, at least around here. You want to call it smart track? That is what it is. It is smart track. It is safe track, and it is sure track. The other thing, it puts America back on the track to economic prosperity.

Pass TPA today and put America back on the track to protect American jobs. Allow the economy to grow, and allow our workers not just to produce



and distribute products at home, but around the world. That is how we win, and that is how the people who depend on us win. When America is strong, America leads.

□ 1000

When we are not strong, we create a vacuum at the top of the world that is going to be filled with bad actors.

Please stop using a false narrative. If you are not informed, get informed; if you are not educated, get educated, but for God's sake, don't be untruthful.

I urge passage of the TPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Members, what I really dislike about this whole debate is that there is so much invective thrown around, claims of untruth.

Now, here is the truth. The reality is that, if we pass trade promotion authority, we will have nothing more than an up-or-down vote at the end of the process. They don't have to take our amendments. They don't have to listen to what we say. Very likely, what will happen is that whatever has been negotiated already will be what the deal is.

For some Members to try to claim that others don't get it or they are not being honest is, quite frankly, insulting and does not add one thing to the quality of the debate.

The American people deserve to know that if trade promotion authority passes, there is a "yes" or "no" vote that will happen at the end of the process, and nobody here will be able to impact it through the normal course of events. We can go to some meetings; we can write some letters; but can we actually legislate? No.

Now, the reason that this is a very bad outcome is because the United States Constitution delegates Congress, this body, with the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. It says: "Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

What we are doing here is taking that constitutional authority and we are handing it to the Executive and hoping for the best.

Now, the people who have been negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership all along are a body of about 600 multinational lawyers and businesspeople. The voice of the workers haven't been there. The voice of the environment has not been there. The voice of ordinary citizens who have every reason to want a better world and impact this process have been muted in favor of big multinational corporate types. We must vote "no" on TPA today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and an awesome free trader.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for giving me time.

Let's set the facts straight here. Liberal union leaders, radical environmentalists, some of our friends on the other side have been relentless in pushing misinformation to confuse and distract the American people. It undermines the confidence that the American people have in this body, the people's House.

Let's look at the facts. TPA, trade promotion authority, it is not a trade agreement. It is the process by which we get the best possible trade agreement, the best possible agreement on behalf of the American worker and the American farmer.

This is Congress asserting its constitutional authority by setting the priorities for our negotiators. We are robustly involved in the negotiation process, and this TPA version is even better than previous ones because it empowers all Members of Congress, not just the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee.

TPA has been public. It has been public for months for anybody and everybody who wants to read it. Just go to congress.gov. It is not secret.

They are trying to deliberately confuse TPA, trade promotion authority, with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is a trade negotiation underway and not completed yet. We want a strong TPP—Trans-Pacific Partnership—agreement for the American workers and for farmers. We won't get that without TPA.

TPA puts a strong check on the President, placing the Congress in the driver's seat with 150 negotiating objectives that must be addressed or else the final agreement won't be brought up for a vote. We will kill it. We have the power, not the President.

It contains strong protections against the President from putting in any new immigration authority in violation of American law. It prevents the President from subverting U.S. sovereignty and all these urban myths that are out there.

Frankly, the misinformation is disturbing, and it undermines the trust of this body. We have to put the facts on the table for the American people. This has been supported by a wide number of groups—business groups, conservatives, many other groups.

If you support transparency, if you support placing a check on the President, if you support robust oversight, and if you support getting the best deal for the American worker, knocking down barriers—whether they are tariff or nontariff barriers in these other countries—to give the American worker a break, open markets, then you support TPA.

TPA is a catalyst for economic growth. It opens the door for a robust trade agenda for the United States.

We created the global trading system after 1945. Are we going to walk away from it? We only have 20 agreements—with 20 countries, that is, free trade agreements. These are important agreements. Other countries have 40, 50, hundreds of them.

Why are we sitting on the sidelines? We have been sitting on the sidelines for decades. It is time for American leadership. We can't walk away from the trading system we created. Our partners around the world want us engaged.

This is the catalyst for American leadership. This is an important part of our national strategy and an important part of our foreign policy.

You want a strategy? You want economic growth? You want fairness for the American worker? Support TPA as a catalyst for growth and leadership.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

I am not going to go into the exact same debate we had 1 week ago because the facts are still the same. If we pass fast track authority, the facts are identical around the fact we will lose jobs here in this country and we will depress our wages here in this country. We will lose our sovereignty and control over our laws, and we will have problems with everything from food safety to intellectual property rights and so many other laws.

What is different about this week from last week is this is not the same trade promotion authority. This trade promotion authority will take away American jobs, but it lacks the trade authority that gives us the assistance and the dollars to help those people find other jobs.

This includes all of the amendments that affect us from taking away the provisions the Senate put in around currency manipulation, take away the amendments around human trafficking, and specifically say that we cannot address climate change in these trade negotiations.

Now, that alone is an issue that I want clarity from the White House on. I have been in and looked at the language, and I will not talk about classified language on the floor, but the amendment specifically—we need clarity about where we are on climate change in this agreement.

This is not the same TPA. It will cost jobs. It will lower our wages. It will not provide any protections for those workers who lose their jobs because of this. Now, because of last week's actions, the bill before us is a far, far worse bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues, let's let the American people have a say. The only way they will is if Congress retains our authority to amend and debate this bill. If we give that away, it is our own fault today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.



Once again, I have to remind my colleagues we have got to follow some understanding about what we are trying to do here. This is TPA.

TAA was up last week, and my colleagues that are Democrats turned down the same things they are now talking about were provisions to protect the American worker. The Democrat Party voted against the American worker last week.

They are the ones that turned down exactly what the gentleman is talking about needs to be a part of this deal. The Democrat Party turned their back on the American worker. That was last week.

This week, now, they are trying to talk about things that are in TPP. Mr. Speaker, we are not here today for TPP. We are here today for trade promotion authority. That is it, TPA.

The gentleman, Mr. KELLY, was very right to say let's talk about the real facts of the case and the truth. This is about TPA. It is exactly the same bill that was here last week.

There were other considerations last week. The Democrat Party turned their back last week on the worker. We are not trying to do that today—trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Cincinnati, Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I think every Member of this body, on both sides of the aisle, have something in common. We all have small businesses in our district and probably a lot of them.

One of the privileges we have, as Members of Congress, is to talk to those people and find out what is important to them. What is important to them is important to the country because about 70 percent of the new jobs that are created in the American economy nowadays are created by small businesses.

In thinking about what I would say about TPA here this morning, I thought, rather than just tell people what I thought about it, I thought I would bring some examples of some of those folks that we have talked to.

As Chair of the Small Business Committee, I get to talk to small businesses all across the country. Here are some examples of what they are telling us.

Here is Michael Stanek of Hunt Imaging in Berea, Ohio. He said:

Free trade agreements are extremely important as they lower foreign barriers to our exports and produce a more level playing field.

Without TPA, the U.S. is relegated to the sidelines as other nations negotiate trade agreements without us, putting American workers and companies, especially small ones, at a competitive disadvantage.

Here is Dyke Messinger of Power Curbers in Salisbury, North Carolina:

Passage of TPA, which lapsed back in 2007, is critical to restore U.S. leadership on trade.

Manufacturers in the U.S. face steeper trade barriers abroad than virtually any other major country, including Mexico and China and European countries, largely because those countries have entered into more market access agreements than the United States. Trade and foreign markets are critical for small businesses like Power Curbers.

Here is Kevin Severns of Severns Farm in Sanger, California.

Without TPA, critical negotiations with some of our key export markets may well stall. My understanding is that, on average, U.S. citrus exports to countries included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership can currently face tariffs as high as 40 percent.

That is tariffs at 40 percent.

Given that 35 percent of California's citrus crop is exported around the world, access to these markets is vital to us.

Here is Brian Bieron of eBay, which helps many small businesses sell their products abroad. He said:

Through our experience, we have found that technology is transforming trade by allowing Main Street businesses to directly take part in globalization, reaping the benefits of markets previously only open to the largest global companies. This is good economics because it means more growth and wealth, and it is good for society because it means a more inclusive form of globalization.

That is what people from around this country—small-business men, small-business women—are saying about TPA and TPP and trade. In effect, they are saying, if we want to grow the American economy and create jobs, which I think we all want to do, we must be proactive on trade, and that means passing TPA and then TPP.

Better trade agreements mean small businesses will be able to access new international customers and offer their products more easily and at a lower cost than ever before.

It means that more products will be built and sold. When that happens, jobs are created, wages go up, and more opportunity is available to all.

You put an American worker against anyone in the world, and I will take that bet every day of the week and twice on Sunday; but we can't get there without TPA.

Without TPA, other nations, especially China, will dictate the rules of the new economy, nations that do not respect the rule of law or the rights of individuals in many cases, especially in the case of China.

Ninety-six percent of the people that are on this globe that we all share live outside the borders of the United States. Many of the world's consumers are not here. We want to sell our products overseas, and TPA gets us on the right track.

□ 1015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding.

I wish to say that if the underlying Trans-Pacific Partnership were such a good deal, then why is the Rules Committee limiting our ability to read it and vet it fully and amend it?

By voting for the trade promotion authority, what we basically do is handcuff Members of Congress. So we should vote "no."

Why should we believe anything the executive branch sends up here? We have a right to read it fully and vet it fully.

Let's look at the history of these trade agreements. Over the last 25 years, every time we have signed a so-called free trade agreement that benefits the 1 percent—not the 99 percent—America has lost more jobs. Post-NAFTA, look what happened. We used to have trade balances with these countries. They have all gone into trade deficit, which means they send us more goods than we are able to get into their markets. Here is what happened after the WTO. Then we got into the China PNTR deal. Then the Colombia deal. Then with Korea.

There hasn't been a balanced trade account in this country for 30 years; 40 million lost jobs; \$9.5 trillion of trade deficit, trading away one-fifth of our economic might to other places.

And what did the American people get? Lost jobs, outsourced jobs, stagnant wages. The average income in regions like mine—\$7,000 less a year than 25 years ago. Not a good deal.

You can't create jobs in America and have free trade when you have closed markets abroad. Japan is closed. Korea is closed. China is closed. Europe limits 10 percent imports. We don't. We have an open market.

You can't create jobs and have free trade when you try to trade with countries where their people have no rights, no legal rights.

This Congress should vote "no" on this Trans-Pacific Partnership, the underlying bill, and the trade promotion authority because we have a right to read the agreement and openly debate it.

Right now we have to go down to a secret room. We have people who monitor us. And we can't even talk to the American people about what is in it. What is free about that?

The executive branch has totally overreached its power. Only four titles of the dozen in this TPP are actually about tariffs.

This bill is a treaty. It should be considered as a treaty, openly read by the Senate, and it should be able to be amended and fully vetted. This is so important. When you have gone through a quarter century of job loss and income loss by the American people, why can't we produce a bill that benefits the 100 percent—not just the 1 percent, the ones that were able to pay the plane tickets to go over to Asia and help to represent very important transnational interests? But there are not just the interests of those companies. We have to represent the interests of the American people.

Let's balance these trade accounts and develop a new trade model—not a NAFTA-based trade model, but a model that produces jobs in America, good

wages, and balanced trade accounts for the first time in a quarter century.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. We forgot to make sure everybody knew: we are only doing TPA today. We are not doing TPP. We are not doing these other agreements. I am sorry. I forgot to say that for the 57th time.

Where we cut deals, we win. With the 20 trade agreements America has, we had a \$10 billion surplus last year alone.

I don't know where all these people are getting off and scaring and making fear statements about the American worker. I don't get it, when they talk about us not passing TAA when they are the ones—the Democrat Party—that turned it down. I don't understand why they are beating us up for putting in provisions about immigration. I guess they want to flood our workforce with foreign workers. I don't get where the Democrat Party and its great stalwarts are coming from today. This is about TPA, and that is what we are going to vote on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear, the Members on this side of the aisle—the Democratic Party Members on this side of the aisle—completely understand what we are debating today. We know we are debating the rule on TPA, the same TPA which has been modified. As the gentleman has said, we are not debating TPP.

The problem we have is, the trade promotion authority is intended to be the method by which this body, this Congress creates the parameters for negotiation of trade agreements, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership. And the reason that this has been difficult, this House and the Republican leadership, in particular, is trying to create a TPA that accommodates the already negotiated TPP.

So while it is a good rhetorical argument to say we are not debating TPP, the fact of the matter is, the reason that there has been such a lack of willingness to consider any modification, any amendments to the TPA bill is because any change would not align with the already negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The reason, for example, that a bipartisan amendment that I and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON) offered—with equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans, 22 of us—to deal with currency manipulation was not made in order is because it would not align with the already negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Most everybody agrees that it would be good policy, but this deal is already written. And now we are trying to back in a TPA bill that it will accommodate the TPP.

So it is rather difficult for me to accept the argument that this TPA question has nothing to do with the Trans-Pacific Partnership when everybody in this House of Representatives knows that it has everything to do with it.

The other thing that is important for us to keep in mind is that this is a worse piece of legislation than the bad one that came before the House last week. Because of the modifications to TPA that came through in the customs bill, as my colleagues have said, despite the fact that many on the other side have argued that our attempts to deal with climate change here in the U.S. alone will not be affected because it is not a global approach, when we have an opportunity to take a broader approach, representing 40 percent of the global economy and deal with climate change, we now have an absolute prohibition, a gag order where we can't talk about climate in the greatest opportunity we would have to deal with climate change; nor can we have even a weak provision regarding currency, which has been excised from the TPA. And, unbelievably, we will actually weaken our ability to deal with bad actors when it comes to human trafficking.

This is shameful, it ought to be rejected.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The gentlewoman from Ohio will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to know, if Members vote in favor of the trade promotion authority currently before us, will Members be allowed to amend the underlying bill, the TPP?

Could the chairman of the Rules Committee address that, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is engaging in debate and is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, in what form could I ask the question that I could get a straight answer as to whether Members will be able to amend the underlying 1,000-page trade agreement called the Trans-Pacific Partnership?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman may look to the managers for a specific item of debate.

Ms. KAPTUR. So, in other words, the chairman of the Rules Committee cannot answer my question? He is my friend. I think it would be important for Members to know that because it is my understanding that we are not allowed to amend the agreement if, in fact, TPA passes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

The gentlewoman from New York is recognized.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

TPA shouldn't stand for "trade promotion authority"; it should stand for "taking prosperity away," because that is exactly what it is going to do for millions of hard-working Americans.

The House failed to advance its proposal less than a week ago, and today the TPA we are voting on is even worse.

And hiding the vote behind our brave first responders? This is shameful.

Republican leaders are doing everything they can to jam through a special interest agenda that will depress wages, exacerbate inequality, and cost jobs. TPA will take away the constitutional responsibility that Congress has to strengthen and improve the Trans-Pacific Partnership. If we approve this measure, we are surrendering our ability to improve a trade agreement for working families.

We are not voting on TPP, as the chairman said, but we are voting on TPA, on the rules to govern these negotiations and the process to be filed. And if we vote for this TPA, we are saying that we are fine moving forward on a trade agreement that has no enforceable provisions against currency manipulation; meaning, there are no protections to stop countries from devaluing their currency, artificially reducing the price of their goods, and putting American manufacturers and American jobs at a competitive disadvantage. We are saying, we are fine with a trade agreement that fails to address the critical issue of climate change. We are saying that we are fine with entering into a trade agreement with countries like Brunei, where LGBT individuals can be stoned to death and women can be flogged in public. We are saying, we are fine with having a trade agreement that weakens protections against human trafficking; and we are fine with entering into a trade agreement with countries like Vietnam, which denies workers even the most basic collective bargaining rights, while throwing workers' advocates into prison.

So we are not voting on TPP. We are voting on TPA. But we are setting the rules for governing the negotiations, and we are removing ourselves from the process of improving and strengthening this trade agreement.

The House should reject this proposal and stand with hard-working Americans. We should oppose TPA. We should oppose the rule.

For 30 years, we have had trade policies in this country that have failed American workers, driving down wages, increasing income inequality, and, as a result of it, costing jobs. A vote for fast track is a vote to abandon our responsibility to ensure that trade works for our country and for American workers.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, to reject the underlying bill, and to vote "no" on TPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will control the time for the minority side.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a letter to Members of Congress from the general president of the International Association of Firefighters opposing House Resolution 321 when it attaches trade promotion authority to H.R. 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF FIRE FIGHTERS,  
June 18, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of more than 300,000 professional fire fighters and emergency medical personnel, I strongly urge you to oppose H.Res.321 which attaches Trade Promotion Authority to HR 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employee's Retirement Act.

The underlying legislation provides an important measure of retirement security to the federal fighters who protect our nation's defense installations, VA hospitals and other vital facilities. It should not be politically exploited and used in a last ditch, desperate effort to pass TPA.

HR 2146, which simply enables federal fire fighters to access their own retirement savings once they reach retirement age, was passed by the House by a vote of 407-5 and adopted unanimously in the Senate with a technical amendment. This amended legislation deserves to be considered free of political gamesmanship and procedural tricks.

The IAFF urges you to oppose this rule, and consider HR 2146 without controversial amendments.

Sincerely,

HAROLD A. SCHATBERGER,  
General President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if we vote for trade promotion authority, fast track, without Trade Adjustment Assistance, if that is how we vote today, that is what we will get.

The Republican chair of the Rules Committee has made it clear. He has already used his precious time to start blaming Democratic leadership for the fact that Trade Adjustment Assistance will not become law.

The fact is that if Trade Adjustment Assistance ever comes before this House, it will, no doubt, be loaded up by the Republican leadership with a host of poison pills, making sure that Democrats cannot vote for it. I can't vote for Trade Adjustment Assistance if you terminate the Affordable Care Act as part of the bill, for example.

Now the proponents of trade promotion authority have had to misstate the actual economic facts, the figures on our trade surpluses and deficits, in order to make their case. They have come again and again and said, we have a trade surplus with our free trade agreement partners.

Completely false. I will put into the RECORD the chart listing each of our

free trade agreement partners, and we are running a \$177 billion deficit in goods. Including services, you are now down to a little over a \$100 billion deficit.

□ 1030

Now, how is it that Member after Member has come here and said something demonstrably false? They have been fooled by slippery charlatans who feed them the following line: Since NAFTA, we have a surplus with those countries that have a free trade agreement.

"Since NAFTA" implies since the early 1990s. No, they mean those agreements we entered into after NAFTA. So they look at our free trade agreements while ignoring NAFTA. That is like looking at the Cavs and ignoring LeBron. You can't do that.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the success and failure of our free trade agreements, number one is NAFTA. If you include all of our free trade agreements, including NAFTA, we have a \$177 billion goods deficit. And then if you look at MFN for China, most favored nation status for China, well, then you are talking \$400 billion of deficit. That was not a free trade agreement. That was an even worse agreement.

This TPP is a gift to China. First, it enshrines the idea that currency manipulation will be allowed, even encouraged. It sets Chinese rules for trade in Asia, preserving for them their number one tactic in running such a huge trade surplus with the United States. It hollows out American manufacturing, thus endangering our national security. And the rules of origin provision available for review in the basement will show you that goods that are 50 and 60 percent made in China, admitted to be made in China, which means actually 70 or 80 percent really made in China, come fast-tracked into the United States. China gets the benefit and doesn't have to make a single concession.

Vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. First, we were all on the fast track, then the slow track with postponement into July, and now we are back on rush-hour scheduling, being told that fast track, which has been mangled in the meantime with new changes, has to be approved by high noon today.

Railroading this bill through now will deny any opportunity to ensure that our trade policy gets on the right track. The fast-trackers have rejected every constructive improvement for a better trade measure that we have advanced. And even these fast-trackers, if they are really candid with the American people, would concede there is not a Member of this Congress who knows what is in this agreement to the extent

that the Vietnamese Politburo does. Because so much of it has been secreted, we do not have one word that has been made public or accessible to us about how it is that Vietnam will enforce provisions to ensure greater worker freedom and opportunity instead of being part of a race to the bottom.

What we do know about this fast-track agreement from a recent Canadian ruling, *Bilcon v. Canada*, is that corporate panels will be empowered to charge taxpayers millions of dollars for the privilege of maintaining public health and safety laws. The language to which my colleague from Texas has referred about preserving American laws is really meaningless because, yes, they are preserved, but when your city or your State acts to protect you, foreign corporations are accorded more rights than American businesses, and they can demand millions for keeping our laws in place.

What we do know is that, since last week, this railroad has picked up some mighty unsavory characters. The irony is that on the very day Pope Francis is formally releasing his encyclical on global warming, this railroad has picked up a troubling new provision that would deny any opportunity to address the greatest environmental challenge that our world faces.

Even Trans-Pacific Partnership supporters concede that it looks like a charter for corporate America rather than a high-level trade agreement. The *Financial Times* said, "In too many aspects, it looks like a charter for corporate America."

We learn, I think, more from USTR's past failures than from its current promises. USTR has never in its history successfully challenged worker or environmental abuses by any of our foreign trading partners. Usually the reason that USTR fails is that it doesn't really try. It doesn't seem to have a belief in law enforcement when it comes to worker and environmental abuse. In Guatemala, it took it eight years to even bring a dispute. In Honduras, it took nearly four years to issue another bureaucratic report. In Peru, we cannot get the audit that USTR was responsible for obtaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, "Asleep at the Wheel" is a great Texas swing band, but it is a horrible philosophy for trade law enforcement. Reject this rule; help us get a better trade policy; protect American families; and advance our economy. We can do better than this by rejecting this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, let me say to my colleagues that they should be appalled by

this process. This is again being brought up under a process where nobody—not just Democrats, but Republicans as well—can offer amendments.

In the United States Senate when TPA was considered, they were able to offer amendments, but when it came before the House last week, we were told we could offer no amendments. The excuse we were given is because, if we passed it, it would go right to the White House. But what we are doing today is actually not going to the White House. It is going back to the Senate, yet we are again being presented with a closed process.

Why can't Members of both sides of the aisle have an opportunity to make their views known on this important issue? Why are we being shut out when it comes to the issue of trade and TPA?

I heard a number of speakers say that this debate is not about TPP. Well, this is indeed about the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Whether or not TPP is implemented will depend almost entirely on whether the President has fast track in place.

The vote on fast track, or TPA, will determine the fate of the TPP trade deal. So a "yes" vote on TPA is a "yes" vote on TPP. It is that simple. History shows that is how it has worked time and time and time again.

Fast track is not just about TPP. If we vote for TPA for fast track, we are fast-tracking any trade deal that any President negotiates anytime in the next 6 years. We have no idea who the next President will be, but you are giving the next President—or next Presidents—the authority to have fast-track authority on whatever they want. Why are we just giving away all of our ability to play a role in these negotiations? The problem with these trade deals is that only the well-off and well-connected have a seat at the table.

I urge my colleagues to put American workers first. Vote "no" on the rule and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the TPP is modeled after a failed trade agreement. It will further erode our national economy and change the rules in ways that hurt American workers. We are supposed to be here to protect the American workers and to create more opportunity, and we are yet going down the road of another trade deal that is going to rob America of important middle class jobs. It is appalling, and this process is appalling.

Vote "no" on the rule, and vote "no" on the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate today has been most interesting about the differences between the speakers who showed up today. One group of speakers is for America, for growth, for America leading, for America engaging the world, and for cutting deals with our friends against one other huge country that will overrun in every sin-

gle economic circumstance the rest of the world because they do not respect intellectual property or rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, this is about gathering together the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to where we gather together the best rules and regulations that we can, parameters by which the President would go negotiate. This isn't about abdication of our role and responsibility. It is trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, please, we understand that some people haven't read the bill. We understand some people think this is about TPP or other agreements, but it is not. This is about a simple process: Are we going to exert our constitutional authority? Are we going to engage the President where the President can go engage the world on behalf of the American worker? Are we going to lead, or are we going to stick our head in the sand?

Mr. Speaker, America needs to lead, and the world wants us to lead. Mr. Speaker, the world wants American products, and American business wants to sell to others without high prices and without tariffs. What we want to do is to compete. That is why we are here today.

I urge adoption of this rule. I look forward to the debate that will follow, and I look forward to our young chairman, PAUL RYAN, leading that effort, proving not only to the Members here today and to you, Mr. Speaker, but to the American people that we want more jobs. We have not created all the jobs that we need in this country. We need more, and this is a part of that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

YEAS—244

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benish

Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat

Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot

Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Delaney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)

Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (PA)  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed

Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline

Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison

Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hastings  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman

Israel	McGovern	Schakowsky
Jackson Lee	McNerney	Schiff
Jeffries	Meeks	Schradner
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Scott (VA)
Jones	Moore	Scott, David
Kaptur	Moulton	Serrano
Keating	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Sherman
Kennedy	Napolitano	Sinema
Kildee	Neal	Sires
Kilmer	Nolan	Slaughter
Kirkpatrick	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Kuster	O'Rourke	Speier
Langevin	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Takai
Larson (CT)	Payne	Takano
Lawrence	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Peters	Titus
Lewis	Peterson	Tonko
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Torres
Lipinski	Pocan	Tsongas
Loeback	Polis	Van Hollen
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lowenthal	Quigley	Veasey
Lowe	Rangel	Vela
Lujan Grisham	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
(NM)	Richmond	Visclosky
Lujan, Ben Ray	Roybal-Allard	Walz
(NM)	Ruiz	Wasserman
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Maloney,	Rush	Waters, Maxine
Carolyn	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
Matsui	T.	Wilson (FL)
McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
McDermott	Sarbanes	

## NOT VOTING—8

Byrne	Gohmert	Jolly
Clyburn	Gosar	Kelly (MS)
Davis, Rodney	Hurt (VA)	

□ 1108

Mrs. ROBY and Mr. BRADY of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 373 on H. Res. 321. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

□ 1115

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY  
EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 321, I call up the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

(d) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2015.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with the amendment printed in House Report 114-167.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

At the end of the Senate amendment, add the following:

TITLE I—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY  
SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

## SEC. 102. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(a) OVERALL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States for agreements subject to the provisions of section 103 are—

(1) to obtain more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and enhance the global economy;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets, equitable trade benefits, and expanded export market opportunities, and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

(9) to promote universal ratification and full compliance with ILO Convention No. 182 Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor;

(10) to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity;

(11) to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce;

(12) to take into account other legitimate United States domestic objectives, including, but not limited to, the protection of legitimate health or safety, essential security, and consumer interests and the law and regulations related thereto; and

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

(b) PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—

(1) TRADE IN GOODS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade in goods are—

(A) to expand competitive market opportunities for exports of goods from the United States and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through the utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers and policies and practices of foreign governments directly related to trade that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade; and

(B) to obtain reciprocal tariff and nontariff barrier elimination agreements, including with respect to those tariff categories covered in section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(2) TRADE IN SERVICES.—(A) The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding trade in services is to expand competitive market opportunities for United States services and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating barriers to international trade in services, such as regulatory and other barriers that deny national treatment and market access or unreasonably restrict the establishment or operations of service suppliers.

(B) Recognizing that expansion of trade in services generates benefits for all sectors of the economy and facilitates trade, the objective described in subparagraph (A) should be pursued through all means, including through a plurilateral agreement with those countries willing and able to undertake high standard services commitments for both existing and new services.

(3) TRADE IN AGRICULTURE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to agriculture is to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of agricultural commodities in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in bulk, specialty crop, and value added commodities by—

(A) securing more open and equitable market access through robust rules on sanitary and phytosanitary measures that—

(i) encourage the adoption of international standards and require a science-based justification be provided for a sanitary or phytosanitary measure if the measure is more restrictive than the applicable international standard;

(ii) improve regulatory coherence, promote the use of systems-based approaches, and appropriately recognize the equivalence of health and safety protection systems of exporting countries;

(iii) require that measures are transparently developed and implemented, are based on risk assessments that take into account relevant international guidelines and scientific data, and are not more restrictive

on trade than necessary to meet the intended purpose; and

(iv) improve import check processes, including testing methodologies and procedures, and certification requirements,

while recognizing that countries may put in place measures to protect human, animal, or plant life or health in a manner consistent with their international obligations, including the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (referred to in section 101(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(3)));

(B) reducing or eliminating, by a date certain, tariffs or other charges that decrease market opportunities for United States exports—

(i) giving priority to those products that are subject to significantly higher tariffs or subsidy regimes of major producing countries; and

(ii) providing reasonable adjustment periods for United States import sensitive products, in close consultation with Congress on such products before initiating tariff reduction negotiations;

(C) reducing tariffs to levels that are the same as or lower than those in the United States;

(D) reducing or eliminating subsidies that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or unfairly distort agriculture markets to the detriment of the United States;

(E) allowing the preservation of programs that support family farms and rural communities but do not distort trade;

(F) developing disciplines for domestic support programs, so that production that is in excess of domestic food security needs is sold at world prices;

(G) eliminating government policies that create price depressing surpluses;

(H) eliminating state trading enterprises whenever possible;

(I) developing, strengthening, and clarifying rules to eliminate practices that unfairly decrease United States market access opportunities or distort agricultural markets to the detriment of the United States, and ensuring that such rules are subject to efficient, timely, and effective dispute settlement, including—

(i) unfair or trade distorting activities of state trading enterprises and other administrative mechanisms, with emphasis on requiring price transparency in the operation of state trading enterprises and such other mechanisms in order to end cross subsidization, price discrimination, and price undercutting;

(ii) unjustified trade restrictions or commercial requirements, such as labeling, that affect new technologies, including biotechnology;

(iii) unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including restrictions not based on scientific principles in contravention of obligations in the Uruguay Round Agreements or bilateral or regional trade agreements;

(iv) other unjustified technical barriers to trade; and

(v) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff rate quotas;

(J) eliminating practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or cyclical products, while improving import relief mechanisms to recognize the unique characteristics of perishable and cyclical agriculture;

(K) ensuring that import relief mechanisms for perishable and cyclical agriculture are as accessible and timely to growers in the United States as those mechanisms that are used by other countries;

(L) taking into account whether a party to the negotiations has failed to adhere to the

provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or has circumvented obligations under those agreements;

(M) taking into account whether a product is subject to market distortions by reason of a failure of a major producing country to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or by the circumvention by that country of its obligations under those agreements;

(N) otherwise ensuring that countries that accede to the World Trade Organization have made meaningful market liberalization commitments in agriculture;

(O) taking into account the impact that agreements covering agriculture to which the United States is a party have on the United States agricultural industry;

(P) maintaining bona fide food assistance programs, market development programs, and export credit programs;

(Q) seeking to secure the broadest market access possible in multilateral, regional, and bilateral negotiations, recognizing the effect that simultaneous sets of negotiations may have on United States import sensitive commodities (including those subject to tariff rate quotas);

(R) seeking to develop an international consensus on the treatment of seasonal or perishable agricultural products in investigations relating to dumping and safeguards and in any other relevant area;

(S) seeking to establish the common base year for calculating the Aggregated Measurement of Support (as defined in the Agreement on Agriculture) as the end of each country's Uruguay Round implementation period, as reported in each country's Uruguay Round market access schedule;

(T) ensuring transparency in the administration of tariff rate quotas through multilateral, plurilateral, and bilateral negotiations; and

(U) eliminating and preventing the undermining of market access for United States products through improper use of a country's system for protecting or recognizing geographical indications, including failing to ensure transparency and procedural fairness and protecting generic terms.

(4) FOREIGN INVESTMENT.—Recognizing that United States law on the whole provides a high level of protection for investment, consistent with or greater than the level required by international law, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding foreign investment are to reduce or eliminate artificial or trade distorting barriers to foreign investment, while ensuring that foreign investors in the United States are not accorded greater substantive rights with respect to investment protections than United States investors in the United States, and to secure for investors important rights comparable to those that would be available under United States legal principles and practice, by—

(A) reducing or eliminating exceptions to the principle of national treatment;

(B) freeing the transfer of funds relating to investments;

(C) reducing or eliminating performance requirements, forced technology transfers, and other unreasonable barriers to the establishment and operation of investments;

(D) seeking to establish standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation, consistent with United States legal principles and practice;

(E) seeking to establish standards for fair and equitable treatment, consistent with United States legal principles and practice, including the principle of due process;

(F) providing meaningful procedures for resolving investment disputes;

(G) seeking to improve mechanisms used to resolve disputes between an investor and a government through—

(i) mechanisms to eliminate frivolous claims and to deter the filing of frivolous claims;

(ii) procedures to ensure the efficient selection of arbitrators and the expeditious disposition of claims;

(iii) procedures to enhance opportunities for public input into the formulation of government positions; and

(iv) providing for an appellate body or similar mechanism to provide coherence to the interpretations of investment provisions in trade agreements; and

(H) ensuring the fullest measure of transparency in the dispute settlement mechanism, to the extent consistent with the need to protect information that is classified or business confidential, by—

(i) ensuring that all requests for dispute settlement are promptly made public;

(ii) ensuring that—

(I) all proceedings, submissions, findings, and decisions are promptly made public; and

(II) all hearings are open to the public; and

(iii) establishing a mechanism for acceptance of amicus curiae submissions from businesses, unions, and nongovernmental organizations.

(5) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade-related intellectual property are—

(A) to further promote adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights, including through—

(i)(I) ensuring accelerated and full implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)), particularly with respect to meeting enforcement obligations under that agreement; and

(II) ensuring that the provisions of any trade agreement governing intellectual property rights that is entered into by the United States reflect a standard of protection similar to that found in United States law;

(ii) providing strong protection for new and emerging technologies and new methods of transmitting and distributing products embodying intellectual property, including in a manner that facilitates legitimate digital trade;

(iii) preventing or eliminating discrimination with respect to matters affecting the availability, acquisition, scope, maintenance, use, and enforcement of intellectual property rights;

(iv) ensuring that standards of protection and enforcement keep pace with technological developments, and in particular ensuring that rightholders have the legal and technological means to control the use of their works through the Internet and other global communication media, and to prevent the unauthorized use of their works;

(v) providing strong enforcement of intellectual property rights, including through accessible, expeditious, and effective civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement mechanisms; and

(vi) preventing or eliminating government involvement in the violation of intellectual property rights, including cyber theft and piracy;

(B) to secure fair, equitable, and non-discriminatory market access opportunities for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; and

(C) to respect the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted by the World Trade Organization at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar on November 14, 2001, and to ensure



that trade agreements foster innovation and promote access to medicines.

(6) **DIGITAL TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES AND CROSS-BORDER DATA FLOWS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to digital trade in goods and services, as well as cross-border data flows, are—

(A) to ensure that current obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments under the World Trade Organization and bilateral and regional trade agreements apply to digital trade in goods and services and to cross-border data flows;

(B) to ensure that—

(i) electronically delivered goods and services receive no less favorable treatment under trade rules and commitments than like products delivered in physical form; and

(ii) the classification of such goods and services ensures the most liberal trade treatment possible, fully encompassing both existing and new trade;

(C) to ensure that governments refrain from implementing trade-related measures that impede digital trade in goods and services, restrict cross-border data flows, or require local storage or processing of data;

(D) with respect to subparagraphs (A) through (C), where legitimate policy objectives require domestic regulations that affect digital trade in goods and services or cross-border data flows, to obtain commitments that any such regulations are the least restrictive on trade, nondiscriminatory, and transparent, and promote an open market environment; and

(E) to extend the moratorium of the World Trade Organization on duties on electronic transmissions.

(7) **REGULATORY PRACTICES.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the use of government regulation or other practices to reduce market access for United States goods, services, and investments are—

(A) to achieve increased transparency and opportunity for the participation of affected parties in the development of regulations;

(B) to require that proposed regulations be based on sound science, cost benefit analysis, risk assessment, or other objective evidence;

(C) to establish consultative mechanisms and seek other commitments, as appropriate, to improve regulatory practices and promote increased regulatory coherence, including through—

(i) transparency in developing guidelines, rules, regulations, and laws for government procurement and other regulatory regimes;

(ii) the elimination of redundancies in testing and certification;

(iii) early consultations on significant regulations;

(iv) the use of impact assessments;

(v) the periodic review of existing regulatory measures; and

(vi) the application of good regulatory practices;

(D) to seek greater openness, transparency, and convergence of standards development processes, and enhance cooperation on standards issues globally;

(E) to promote regulatory compatibility through harmonization, equivalence, or mutual recognition of different regulations and standards and to encourage the use of international and interoperable standards, as appropriate;

(F) to achieve the elimination of government measures such as price controls and reference pricing which deny full market access for United States products;

(G) to ensure that government regulatory reimbursement regimes are transparent, provide procedural fairness, are nondiscriminatory, and provide full market access for United States products; and

(H) to ensure that foreign governments—

(i) demonstrate that the collection of undisclosed proprietary information is limited to that necessary to satisfy a legitimate and justifiable regulatory interest; and

(ii) protect such information against disclosure, except in exceptional circumstances to protect the public, or where such information is effectively protected against unfair competition.

(8) **STATE-OWNED AND STATE-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding competition by state-owned and state-controlled enterprises is to seek commitments that—

(A) eliminate or prevent trade distortions and unfair competition favoring state-owned and state-controlled enterprises to the extent of their engagement in commercial activity, and

(B) ensure that such engagement is based solely on commercial considerations,

in particular through disciplines that eliminate or prevent discrimination and market-distorting subsidies and that promote transparency.

(9) **LOCALIZATION BARRIERS TO TRADE.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to localization barriers is to eliminate and prevent measures that require United States producers and service providers to locate facilities, intellectual property, or other assets in a country as a market access or investment condition, including indigenous innovation measures.

(10) **LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to labor and the environment are—

(A) to ensure that a party to a trade agreement with the United States—

(i) adopts and maintains measures implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)) and its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)),

(ii) does not waive or otherwise derogate from, or offer to waive or otherwise derogate from—

(I) its statutes or regulations implementing internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)), in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, where the waiver or derogation would be inconsistent with one or more such standards, or

(II) its environmental laws in a manner that weakens or reduces the protections afforded in those laws and in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, except as provided in its law and provided not inconsistent with its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(6)) or other provisions of the trade agreement specifically agreed upon, and

(iii) does not fail to effectively enforce its environmental or labor laws, through a sustained or recurring course of action or inaction,

in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party after entry into force of a trade agreement between those countries;

(B) to recognize that—

(i) with respect to environment, parties to a trade agreement retain the right to exercise prosecutorial discretion and to make decisions regarding the allocation of enforcement resources with respect to other environmental laws determined to have higher priorities, and a party is effectively enforcing its laws if a course of action or inaction reflects a reasonable, bona fide exercise of such discretion, or results from a reasonable,

bona fide decision regarding the allocation of resources; and

(ii) with respect to labor, decisions regarding the distribution of enforcement resources are not a reason for not complying with a party's labor obligations; a party to a trade agreement retains the right to reasonable exercise of discretion and to make bona fide decisions regarding the allocation of resources between labor enforcement activities among core labor standards, provided the exercise of such discretion and such decisions are not inconsistent with its obligations;

(C) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to promote respect for core labor standards (as defined in section 111(7));

(D) to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to protect the environment through the promotion of sustainable development;

(E) to reduce or eliminate government practices or policies that unduly threaten sustainable development;

(F) to seek market access, through the elimination of tariffs and nontariff barriers, for United States environmental technologies, goods, and services;

(G) to ensure that labor, environmental, health, or safety policies and practices of the parties to trade agreements with the United States do not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate against United States exports or serve as disguised barriers to trade;

(H) to ensure that enforceable labor and environment obligations are subject to the same dispute settlement and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement; and

(I) to ensure that a trade agreement is not construed to empower a party's authorities to undertake labor or environmental law enforcement activities in the territory of the United States.

(11) **CURRENCY.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to currency practices is that parties to a trade agreement with the United States avoid manipulating exchange rates in order to prevent effective balance of payments adjustment or to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other parties to the agreement, such as through cooperative mechanisms, enforceable rules, reporting, monitoring, transparency, or other means, as appropriate.

(12) **FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to unfair currency practices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, reporting, monitoring, cooperative mechanisms, or other means to address exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the exchange markets and a persistently undervalued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, consistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.

(13) **WTO AND MULTILATERAL TRADE AGREEMENTS.**—Recognizing that the World Trade Organization is the foundation of the global trading system, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding the World Trade Organization, the Uruguay Round Agreements, and other multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements are—

(A) to achieve full implementation and extend the coverage of the World Trade Organization and multilateral and plurilateral agreements to products, sectors, and conditions of trade not adequately covered;

(B) to expand country participation in and enhancement of the Information Technology



Agreement, the Government Procurement Agreement, and other plurilateral trade agreements of the World Trade Organization;

(C) to expand competitive market opportunities for United States exports and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, through the negotiation of new WTO multilateral and plurilateral trade agreements, such as an agreement on trade facilitation;

(D) to ensure that regional trade agreements to which the United States is not a party fully achieve the high standards of, and comply with, WTO disciplines, including Article XXIV of GATT 1994, Article V and V bis of the General Agreement on Trade in Services, and the Enabling Clause, including through meaningful WTO review of such regional trade agreements;

(E) to enhance compliance by WTO members with their obligations as WTO members through active participation in the bodies of the World Trade Organization by the United States and all other WTO members, including in the trade policy review mechanism and the committee system of the World Trade Organization, and by working to increase the effectiveness of such bodies; and

(F) to encourage greater cooperation between the World Trade Organization and other international organizations.

(14) **TRADE INSTITUTION TRANSPARENCY.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to transparency is to obtain wider and broader application of the principle of transparency in the World Trade Organization, entities established under bilateral and regional trade agreements, and other international trade fora through seeking—

(A) timely public access to information regarding trade issues and the activities of such institutions;

(B) openness by ensuring public access to appropriate meetings, proceedings, and submissions, including with regard to trade and investment dispute settlement; and

(C) public access to all notifications and supporting documentation submitted by WTO members.

(15) **ANTI-CORRUPTION.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to the use of money or other things of value to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any improper advantage in a manner affecting trade are—

(A) to obtain high standards and effective domestic enforcement mechanisms applicable to persons from all countries participating in the applicable trade agreement that prohibit such attempts to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any such improper advantage;

(B) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and

(C) to seek commitments to work jointly to encourage and support anti-corruption and anti-bribery initiatives in international trade fora, including through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, done at Paris December 17, 1997 (commonly known as the “OECD Anti-Bribery Convention”).

(16) **DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND ENFORCEMENT.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to dispute settlement and enforcement of trade agreements are—

(A) to seek provisions in trade agreements providing for resolution of disputes between governments under those trade agreements in an effective, timely, transparent, equi-

table, and reasoned manner, requiring determinations based on facts and the principles of the agreements, with the goal of increasing compliance with the agreements;

(B) to seek to strengthen the capacity of the Trade Policy Review Mechanism of the World Trade Organization to review compliance with commitments;

(C) to seek adherence by panels convened under the Dispute Settlement Understanding and by the Appellate Body to—

(i) the mandate of those panels and the Appellate Body to apply the WTO Agreement as written, without adding to or diminishing rights and obligations under the Agreement; and

(ii) the standard of review applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreement involved in the dispute, including greater deference, where appropriate, to the fact finding and technical expertise of national investigating authorities;

(D) to seek provisions encouraging the early identification and settlement of disputes through consultation;

(E) to seek provisions to encourage the provision of trade-expanding compensation if a party to a dispute under the agreement does not come into compliance with its obligations under the agreement;

(F) to seek provisions to impose a penalty upon a party to a dispute under the agreement that—

(i) encourages compliance with the obligations of the agreement;

(ii) is appropriate to the parties, nature, subject matter, and scope of the violation; and

(iii) has the aim of not adversely affecting parties or interests not party to the dispute while maintaining the effectiveness of the enforcement mechanism; and

(G) to seek provisions that treat United States principal negotiating objectives equally with respect to—

(i) the ability to resort to dispute settlement under the applicable agreement;

(ii) the availability of equivalent dispute settlement procedures; and

(iii) the availability of equivalent remedies.

(17) **TRADE REMEDY LAWS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are—

(A) to preserve the ability of the United States to enforce rigorously its trade laws, including the antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard laws, and avoid agreements that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international disciplines on unfair trade, especially dumping and subsidies, or that lessen the effectiveness of domestic and international safeguard provisions, in order to ensure that United States workers, agricultural producers, and firms can compete fully on fair terms and enjoy the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions; and

(B) to address and remedy market distortions that lead to dumping and subsidization, including overcapacity, cartelization, and market access barriers.

(18) **BORDER TAXES.**—The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding border taxes is to obtain a revision of the rules of the World Trade Organization with respect to the treatment of border adjustments for internal taxes to redress the disadvantage to countries relying primarily on direct taxes for revenue rather than indirect taxes.

(19) **TEXTILE NEGOTIATIONS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in textiles and apparel articles are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of textiles and apparel in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States

markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in textiles and apparel.

(20) **COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIPS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to an agreement that is proposed to be entered into with the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership countries and to which section 103(b) will apply, the principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships are the following:

(i) To discourage actions by potential trading partners that directly or indirectly prejudice or otherwise discourage commercial activity solely between the United States and Israel.

(ii) To discourage politically motivated actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel and to seek the elimination of politically motivated nontariff barriers on Israeli goods, services, or other commerce imposed on the State of Israel.

(iii) To seek the elimination of state-sponsored unsanctioned foreign boycotts against Israel or compliance with the Arab League Boycott of Israel by prospective trading partners.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term “actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel” means actions by states, non-member states of the United Nations, international organizations, or affiliated agencies of international organizations that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial relations specifically with Israel or persons doing business in Israel or in Israeli-controlled territories.

(21) **GOOD GOVERNANCE, TRANSPARENCY, THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LEGAL REGIMES, AND THE RULE OF LAW OF TRADING PARTNERS.**—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to ensuring implementation of trade commitments and obligations by strengthening good governance, transparency, the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law of trading partners of the United States is through capacity building and other appropriate means, which are important parts of the broader effort to create more open democratic societies and to promote respect for internationally recognized human rights.

(C) **CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIORITIES.**—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall—

(1) direct the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by consulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concerning that country's laws relating to customs and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mechanisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environment and human health based on sound science;

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with parties to such agreements regarding the consistency of any such agreement that includes trade measures with existing environmental exceptions under Article XX of GATT 1994; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate an

annual report on capacity-building activities undertaken in connection with trade agreements negotiated or being negotiated pursuant to this title.

#### SEC. 103. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c); and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuance of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such additional duties, as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify Congress of the President's intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of the enactment of this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreements or a successor agreement, on any import sensitive agricultural product; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—

(A) AGGREGATE REDUCTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of  $\frac{1}{10}$  of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(5) ROUNDING.—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computa-

tion of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B)  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (3) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 106 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), and subject to the consultation and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3524), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization.

(8) AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(b) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NONTARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Whenever the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or any other import restriction of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or effect,

and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President may enter into a trade agreement described in subparagraph (B) during the period described in subparagraph (C).

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under subparagraph (A) with foreign countries providing for—

(i) the reduction or elimination of a duty, restriction, barrier, or other distortion described in subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the prohibition of, or limitation on the imposition of, such barrier or other distortion.

(C) The President may enter into a trade agreement under this paragraph before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c).

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) CONDITIONS.—A trade agreement may be entered into under this subsection only if such agreement makes progress in meeting the applicable objectives described in subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 and the President satisfies the conditions set forth in sections 104 and 105.

(3) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—(A) The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (in this title referred to as “trade authorities procedures”) apply to a bill of either House of Congress which contains provisions described

in subparagraph (B) to the same extent as such section 151 applies to implementing bills under that section. A bill to which this paragraph applies shall hereafter in this title be referred to as an “implementing bill”.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) if changes in existing laws or new statutory authority are required to implement such trade agreement or agreements, only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement such trade agreement or agreements, either repealing or amending existing laws or providing new statutory authority.

(C) EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL PROCESS FOR CONGRESSIONAL TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 106(b)—

(A) the trade authorities procedures apply to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(B) the trade authorities procedures shall be extended to implementing bills submitted with respect to trade agreements entered into under subsection (b) after June 30, 2018, and before July 1, 2021, if (and only if)—

(i) the President requests such extension under paragraph (2); and

(ii) neither House of Congress adopts an extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (5) before July 1, 2018.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.—If the President is of the opinion that the trade authorities procedures should be extended to implementing bills described in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall submit to Congress, not later than April 1, 2018, a written report that contains a request for such extension, together with—

(A) a description of all trade agreements that have been negotiated under subsection (b) and the anticipated schedule for submitting such agreements to Congress for approval;

(B) a description of the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title, and a statement that such progress justifies the continuation of negotiations; and

(C) a statement of the reasons why the extension is needed to complete the negotiations.

(3) OTHER REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(A) REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The President shall promptly inform the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advisory Committee shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The President shall promptly inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018,

a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) **STATUS OF REPORTS.**—The reports submitted to Congress under paragraphs (2) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) **EXTENSION DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTIONS.**—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “extension disapproval resolution” means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the \_\_\_\_\_ disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.”, with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) Extension disapproval resolutions—

(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and

(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to extension disapproval resolutions.

(D) It is not in order for—

(i) the House of Representatives to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules;

(ii) the Senate to consider any extension disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance; or

(iii) either House of Congress to consider an extension disapproval resolution after June 30, 2018.

(d) **COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.**—In order to contribute to the continued economic expansion of the United States, the President shall commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers affecting any industry, product, or service sector, and expand existing sectoral agreements to countries that are not parties to those agreements, in cases where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. Such sectors include agriculture, commercial services, intellectual property rights, industrial and capital goods, government procurement, information technology products, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, civil aircraft, and infrastructure products. In so doing, the President shall take into account all of the negotiating objectives set forth in section 102.

#### **SEC. 104. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.**

(a) **CONSULTATIONS WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**—

(1) **CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.**—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those

laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of any Member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with jurisdiction over laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) **CONSULTATIONS PRIOR TO ENTRY INTO FORCE.**—Prior to exchanging notes providing for the entry into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) **ENHANCED COORDINATION WITH CONGRESS.**—

(A) **WRITTEN GUIDELINES.**—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with Congress, including coordination with designated congressional advisers under subsection (b), regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) **CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.**—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall enhance coordination with Congress through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings upon request of any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status of negotiations in progress conducted under this title, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information with Members of Congress, and their staff with proper security clearances as appropriate, regarding those negotiations and pertinent documents related to those negotiations (including classified information), and with committee staff with proper security clearances as would be appropriate in the light of the responsibilities of that committee over the trade agreements programs affected by those negotiations.

(C) **DISSEMINATION.**—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A)

to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) **DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.**—

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—

(A) **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In each Congress, any Member of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) **SENATE.**—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) **CONSULTATIONS WITH DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL ADVISERS.**—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).

(3) **ACCREDITATION.**—Each Member of Congress designated as a congressional adviser under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiating sessions relating to trade agreements.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUPS ON NEGOTIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the “congressional advisory groups”).

(2) **MEMBERS AND FUNCTIONS.**—

(A) **MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.**—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the House of Representatives that would have, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(B) **MEMBERSHIP OF THE SENATE ADVISORY GROUP ON NEGOTIATIONS.**—In each Congress, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) The chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) The chairman and ranking member, or their designees, of the committees of the

Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress and to which this title would apply.

(C) ACCREDITATION.—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable trade agreement, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement.

(E) CHAIR.—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(F) COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups may submit comments to the member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

#### (3) GUIDELINES.—

(A) PURPOSE AND REVISION.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be specified in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) access by members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance and enforcement of negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 105(d)(3).

(4) REQUEST FOR MEETING.—Upon the request of a majority of either of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

#### (d) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

#### (e) CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on enhanced coordination with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(A) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(B) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas the member represents, and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction

over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER IN THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) There shall be in the Office one Chief Transparency Officer. The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with Congress on transparency policy, coordinate transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.”

#### SEC. 105. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.—

(1) NOTICE.—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 103(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, written notice to Congress of the President's intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement;

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c);

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c), meet with the requesting congressional advisory group before initiating the negotiations or at any other time concerning the negotiations; and

(D) after consulting with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance, and at least 30 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, publish on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and regularly update thereafter, a detailed and comprehensive summary of the specific objectives with respect to the negotiations, and a description of how the agreement, if successfully concluded, will further those objectives and benefit the United States.

#### (2) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.—

(A) ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter under section 102(b)(3)(B) with any country, the President shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country;

(ii) consider whether the tariff levels bound and applied throughout the world with respect to imports from the United States are higher than United States tariffs and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(iii) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS ON IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.—(i) Before initiating negotiations with regard to agriculture and, with respect to agreements described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 107(a), as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(I) identify those agricultural products subject to tariff rate quotas on the date of enactment of this Act, and agricultural products subject to tariff reductions by the United States as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, for which the rate of duty was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate which was not less than 97.5 percent of the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994;

(II) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning—

(aa) whether any further tariff reductions on the products identified under subclause (I) should be appropriate, taking into account the impact of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned;

(bb) whether the products so identified face unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including those not based on scientific principles in contravention of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(cc) whether the countries participating in the negotiations maintain export subsidies or other programs, policies, or practices that distort world trade in such products and the impact of such programs, policies, and practices on United States producers of the products;

(III) request that the International Trade Commission prepare an assessment of the probable economic effects of any such tariff reduction on the United States industry producing the product concerned and on the United States economy as a whole; and

(IV) upon complying with subclauses (I), (II), and (III), notify the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate of those products identified under subclause (I) for which the Trade Representative intends to seek tariff liberalization in the negotiations and the reasons for seeking such tariff liberalization.

(ii) If, after negotiations described in clause (i) are commenced—

(I) the United States Trade Representative identifies any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) for tariff reductions which were not the subject of a notification under clause (i)(IV), or

(II) any additional agricultural product described in clause (i)(I) is the subject of a request for tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations,

the Trade Representative shall, as soon as practicable, notify the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the reasons for seeking such tariff reductions.

(3) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY.—Before initiating, or continuing, negotiations that directly relate to fish or shellfish trade with any country, the Presi-

dent shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(4) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING TEXTILES.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(5) ADHERENCE TO EXISTING INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT AGREEMENT OBLIGATIONS.—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account the extent to which that country has implemented, or has accelerated the implementation of, its international trade and investment commitments to the United States, including pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS BEFORE ENTRY INTO AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 103(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

(2) SCOPE.—The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and to what extent the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 106, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(3) REPORT REGARDING UNITED STATES TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—

(A) CHANGES IN CERTAIN TRADE LAWS.—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate—

(i) the range of proposals advanced in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could require amendments to title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(ii) how these proposals relate to the objectives described in section 102(b)(16).

(B) RESOLUTIONS.—(i) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), if a resolution is introduced with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (iii)

through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) no procedural disapproval resolution under section 106(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations to which the report under subparagraph (A) relates has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(ii) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term “resolution” means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the \_\_\_\_\_ finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on \_\_\_\_\_ under section 105(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 with respect to \_\_\_\_\_, are inconsistent with the negotiating objectives described in section 102(b)(16) of that Act.”, with the first blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress, the second blank space being filled with the appropriate date of the report, and the third blank space being filled with the name of the country or countries involved.

(iii) Resolutions in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(iv) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(4) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 shall be provided to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 103(a)(2) or 106(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(c) INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION ASSESSMENT.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION TO COMMISSION.—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the “Commission”) with the details of the agreement as it exists at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the

agreement as described in paragraph (2). Between the time the President makes the request under this paragraph and the time the Commission submits the assessment, the President shall keep the Commission current with respect to the details of the agreement.

(2) **ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 105 calendar days after the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report assessing the likely impact of the agreement on the United States economy as a whole and on specific industry sectors, including the impact the agreement will have on the gross domestic product, exports and imports, aggregate employment and employment opportunities, the production, employment, and competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the agreement, and the interests of United States consumers.

(3) **REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE.**—In preparing the assessment under paragraph (2), the Commission shall review available economic assessments regarding the agreement, including literature regarding any substantially equivalent proposed agreement, and shall provide in its assessment a description of the analyses used and conclusions drawn in such literature, and a discussion of areas of consensus and divergence between the various analyses and conclusions, including those of the Commission regarding the agreement.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The President shall make each assessment under paragraph (2) available to the public.

(d) **REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES WITH AGREEMENT.**—

(1) **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS AND REPORTS.**—The President shall—

(A) conduct environmental reviews of future trade and investment agreements, consistent with Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169), dated November 16, 1999, and its relevant guidelines; and

(B) submit a report on those reviews and on the content and operation of consultative mechanisms established pursuant to section 102(c) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(2) **EMPLOYMENT IMPACT REVIEWS AND REPORTS.**—The President shall—

(A) review the impact of future trade agreements on United States employment, including labor markets, modeled after Executive Order 13141 (64 Fed. Reg. 63169) to the extent appropriate in establishing procedures and criteria; and

(B) submit a report on such reviews to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate at the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E).

(3) **REPORT ON LABOR RIGHTS.**—The President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on a timeframe determined in accordance with section 104(c)(3)(B)(v)—

(A) a meaningful labor rights report of the country, or countries, with respect to which the President is negotiating; and

(B) a description of any provisions that would require changes to the labor laws and labor practices of the United States.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.

(e) **IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E), the President shall also submit to Congress a plan for implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) **BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.**—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs and agricultural inspectors.

(B) **AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.**—A description of additional personnel required by Federal agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture (including additional personnel required to implement sanitary and phytosanitary measures in order to obtain market access for United States exports), the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) **CUSTOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS.**—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) **IMPACT ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) **COST ANALYSIS.**—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(3) **BUDGET SUBMISSION.**—The President shall include a request for the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, after the date of the submission of the plan.

(4) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The President shall make the plan required under this subsection available to the public.

(f) **OTHER REPORTS.**—

(1) **REPORT ON PENALTIES.**—Not later than one year after the imposition by the United States of a penalty or remedy permitted by a trade agreement to which this title applies, the President shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the penalty or remedy applied under United States law in enforcing United States rights under the trade agreement, which shall address whether the penalty or remedy was effective in changing the behavior of the targeted party and whether the penalty or remedy had any adverse impact on parties or interests not party to the dispute.

(2) **REPORT ON IMPACT OF TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 5 years thereafter, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements with respect to which Congress has enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures since January 1, 1984.

(3) **ENFORCEMENT CONSULTATIONS AND REPORTS.**—(A) The United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate after acceptance of a petition for review or taking an enforcement action in regard to an obligation under a trade agreement, including a labor or envi-

ronmental obligation. During such consultations, the United States Trade Representative shall describe the matter, including the basis for such action and the application of any relevant legal obligations.

(B) As part of the report required pursuant to section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213), the President shall report annually to Congress on enforcement actions taken pursuant to a trade agreement to which the United States is a party, as well as on any public reports issued by Federal agencies on enforcement matters relating to a trade agreement.

(g) **ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.**—Any Member of the House of Representatives may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and any Member of the Senate may submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

## SEC. 106. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.**—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, at least 90 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(B) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the agreement, publishes the text of the agreement on a publicly available Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative;

(C) within 60 days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(D) the President, at least 30 days before submitting to Congress the materials under subparagraph (E), submits to Congress—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement;

(E) after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft of an implementing bill described in section 103(b)(3);

(ii) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(iii) the supporting information described in paragraph (2)(A);

(F) the implementing bill is enacted into law; and

(G) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the agreement enters into force with respect to a party to the agreement, submits written notice to Congress that the President has determined that the party has taken measures necessary to comply with those provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date on which the agreement enters into force.

(2) **SUPPORTING INFORMATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The supporting information required under paragraph (1)(E)(iii) consists of—



(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(I) asserting that the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(II) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 103(b)(3).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) does not receive benefits under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(4) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or other understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacts an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force and effect under United States law or in any dispute settlement body.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(1) FOR LACK OF NOTICE OR CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) if during the 60-day period beginning on the date that one House of Congress agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution for lack of notice or consultations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements, the other House separately agrees to a procedural disapproval resolution with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(B) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term “procedural disapproval resolution” means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to \_\_\_\_\_ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act

shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.”, with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements with respect to which the President is considered to have failed or refused to notify or consult.

(ii) For purposes of clause (i) and paragraphs (3)(C) and (4)(C), the President has “failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015” on negotiations with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements if—

(I) the President has failed or refused to consult (as the case may be) in accordance with sections 104 and 105 and this section with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(II) guidelines under section 104 have not been developed or met with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements;

(III) the President has not met with the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations pursuant to a request made under section 104(c)(4) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements; or

(IV) the agreement or agreements fail to make progress in achieving the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title.

(2) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolutions—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee; and

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution with respect to that trade agreement has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to the procedures set forth in clauses (iii) through (vii) of such section.

(C) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(D) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN SENATE OF CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION TO REMOVE TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—

(A) REPORTING OF RESOLUTION.—If, when the Committee on Finance of the Senate meets on whether to report an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b), the committee fails to favorably report the bill, the committee shall report a resolution described in subparagraph (C).

(B) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A) if the Committee on Finance reports a resolution described in subparagraph (C) and such resolution is agreed to by the Senate.

(C) RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A resolution described in this subparagraph is a resolution of the Senate originating from the Committee on Finance the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to \_\_\_\_\_ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the Senate to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.”, with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A).

(D) PROCEDURES.—If the Senate does not agree to a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to a resolution described in subparagraph (C), the resolution shall be committed to the Committee on Finance.

(4) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF A CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION.—

(A) QUALIFICATIONS FOR REPORTING RESOLUTION.—If—

(i) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives reports an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b) with other than a favorable recommendation; and

(ii) a Member of the House of Representatives has introduced a consultation and compliance resolution on the legislative day following the filing of a report to accompany the implementing bill with other than a favorable recommendation,

then the Committee on Ways and Means shall consider a consultation and compliance resolution pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF A QUALIFYING RESOLUTION.—(i) Not later than the fourth legislative day after the date of introduction of the resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means shall meet to consider a resolution meeting the qualifications set forth in subparagraph (A).

(ii) After consideration of one such resolution by the Committee on Ways and Means, this subparagraph shall not apply to any other such resolution.

(iii) If the Committee on Ways and Means has not reported the resolution by the sixth legislative day after the date of its introduction, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(C) CONSULTATION AND COMPLIANCE RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A consultation and compliance resolution—

(i) is a resolution of the House of Representatives, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to \_\_\_\_\_ and, therefore, the trade authorities procedures under that Act shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.”, with the blank space being filled with a description of the trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.



(D) **APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.**—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or agreements which are the object of a consultation and compliance resolution if such resolution is adopted by the House.

(5) **FOR FAILURE TO MEET OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the United States Trade Representative, shall transmit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the executive branch to address concerns of Congress regarding whether dispute settlement panels and the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization have added to obligations, or diminished rights, of the United States, as described in section 102(b)(15)(C). Trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill with respect to an agreement negotiated under the auspices of the World Trade Organization unless the Secretary of Commerce has issued such report by the deadline specified in this paragraph.

(6) **LIMITATIONS ON PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO AGREEMENTS WITH COUNTRIES NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 103(b) with a country to which the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking are applicable and the government of which does not fully comply with such standards and is not making significant efforts to bring the country into compliance (commonly referred to as a “tier 3” country), as determined in the most recent annual report on trafficking in persons submitted under section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)).

(B) **MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term “minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking” means the standards set forth in section 108 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106).

(C) **RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.**—Subsection (b) of this section, section 103(c), and section 105(b)(3) are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with the full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

#### **SEC. 107. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS FOR WHICH NEGOTIATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEGUN.**

(a) **CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.**—Notwithstanding the prenegotiation notification and consultation requirement described in section 105(a), if an agreement to which section 103(b) applies—

(1) is entered into under the auspices of the World Trade Organization,

(2) is entered into with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries with respect to which notifications have been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

(3) is entered into with the European Union,

(4) is an agreement with respect to international trade in services entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(5) is an agreement with respect to environmental goods entered into with WTO members with respect to which a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, and results from negotiations that were commenced before the date of the enactment of this Act, subsection (b) shall apply.

(b) **TREATMENT OF AGREEMENTS.**—In the case of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies, the applicability of the trade authorities procedures to implementing bills shall be determined without regard to the requirements of section 105(a) (relating only to notice prior to initiating negotiations), and any resolution under paragraph (1)(B), (3)(C), or (4)(C) of section 106(b) shall not be in order on the basis of a failure or refusal to comply with the provisions of section 105(a), if (and only if) the President, as soon as feasible after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) notifies Congress of the negotiations described in subsection (a), the specific United States objectives in the negotiations, and whether the President is seeking a new agreement or changes to an existing agreement; and

(2) before and after submission of the notice, consults regarding the negotiations with the committees referred to in section 105(a)(1)(B) and the House and Senate Advisory Groups on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

#### **SEC. 108. SOVEREIGNTY.**

(a) **UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN EVENT OF CONFLICT.**—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b), nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States shall have effect.

(b) **AMENDMENTS OR MODIFICATIONS OF UNITED STATES LAW.**—No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall prevent the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality of the United States from amending or modifying any law of the United States, that State, or that locality (as the case may be).

(c) **DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.**—Reports, including findings and recommendations, issued by dispute settlement panels convened pursuant to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall have no binding effect on the law of the United States, the Government of the United States, or the law or government of any State or locality of the United States.

#### **SEC. 109. INTERESTS OF SMALL BUSINESSES.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Trade Representative should facilitate participation by small businesses in the trade negotiation process; and

(2) the functions of the Office of the United States Trade Representative relating to small businesses should continue to be reflected in the title of the Assistant United States Trade Representative assigned the responsibility for small businesses.

(b) **CONSIDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS INTERESTS.**—The Assistant United States Trade Representative for Small Business, Market Access, and Industrial Competitiveness shall be responsible for ensuring that the interests of small businesses are consid-

ered in all trade negotiations in accordance with the objective described in section 102(a)(8).

#### **SEC. 110. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.**

(a) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **ADVICE FROM UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—Section 131 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2151) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 2103(a) or (b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 2103(b) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “section 2103(a)(3)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103(a)(4)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(2) **HEARINGS.**—Section 132 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2152) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(3) **PUBLIC HEARINGS.**—Section 133(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2153(a)) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(4) **PREREQUISITES FOR OFFERS.**—Section 134 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2154) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” each place it appears and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(5) **INFORMATION AND ADVICE FROM PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS.**—Section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” each place it appears and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(II) by striking “not later than the date on which the President notifies the Congress under section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 106(a)(1)(A) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 2102 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 102 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(6) PROCEDURES RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING BILLS.—Section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “section 2105(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(7) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 162(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2212(a)) is amended by striking “section 2103 of the Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act of 2002” and inserting “section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

(b) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—For purposes of applying sections 125, 126, and 127 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2135, 2136, and 2137)—

(1) any trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as an agreement entered into under section 101 or 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2111 or 2112), as appropriate; and

(2) any proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as a proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112).

#### SEC. 111. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE.—The term “Agreement on Agriculture” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(2)).

(2) AGREEMENT ON SAFEGUARDS.—The term “Agreement on Safeguards” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(13) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(13)).

(3) AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.—The term “Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures” means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

(4) ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT.—The term “Antidumping Agreement” means the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 referred to in section 101(d)(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(7)).

(5) APPELLATE BODY.—The term “Appellate Body” means the Appellate Body established under Article 17.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(6) COMMON MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “common multilateral environmental agreement” means any agreement specified in subparagraph (B) or included under subparagraph (C) to which both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations are full parties, including any current or future mutually agreed upon protocols, amendments, annexes, or adjustments to such an agreement.

(B) AGREEMENTS SPECIFIED.—The agreements specified in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, done at Washington March 3, 1973 (27 UST 1087; TIAS 8249).

(ii) The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, done at Montreal September 16, 1987.

(iii) The Protocol of 1978 Relating to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, done at London February 17, 1978.

(iv) The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, done at Ramsar February 2, 1971 (TIAS 11084).

(v) The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, done at Canberra May 20, 1980 (33 UST 3476).

(vi) The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, done at Washington December 2, 1946 (62 Stat. 1716).

(vii) The Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, done at Washington May 31, 1949 (1 UST 230).

(C) ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS.—Both the United States and one or more other parties to the negotiations may agree to include any other multilateral environmental or conservation agreement to which they are full parties as a common multilateral environmental agreement under this paragraph.

(7) CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term “core labor standards” means—

(A) freedom of association;

(B) the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;

(C) the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor;

(D) the effective abolition of child labor and a prohibition on the worst forms of child labor; and

(E) the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

(8) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.—The term “Dispute Settlement Understanding” means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(16)).

(9) ENABLING CLAUSE.—The term “Enabling Clause” means the Decision on Differential and More Favourable Treatment, Reciprocity and Fuller Participation of Developing Countries (L/4903), adopted November 28, 1979, under GATT 1947 (as defined in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501)).

(10) ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—The term “environmental laws”, with respect to the laws of the United States, means environmental statutes and regulations enforceable by action of the Federal Government.

(11) GATT 1994.—The term “GATT 1994” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

(12) GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN SERVICES.—The term “General Agreement on Trade in Services” means the General Agreement on Trade in Services (referred to in section 101(d)(14) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(14))).

(13) GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT AGREEMENT.—The term “Government Procurement Agreement” means the Agreement on Government Procurement referred to in section 101(d)(17) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(17)).

(14) ILO.—The term “ILO” means the International Labor Organization.

(15) IMPORT SENSITIVE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT.—The term “import sensitive agricultural product” means an agricultural product—

(A) with respect to which, as a result of the Uruguay Round Agreements, the rate of duty was the subject of tariff reductions by the United States and, pursuant to such Agreements, was reduced on January 1, 1995, to a rate that was not less than 97.5 percent of

the rate of duty that applied to such article on December 31, 1994; or

(B) which was subject to a tariff rate quota on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(16) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGREEMENT.—The term “Information Technology Agreement” means the Ministerial Declaration on Trade in Information Technology Products of the World Trade Organization, agreed to at Singapore December 13, 1996.

(17) INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term “internationally recognized core labor standards” means the core labor standards only as stated in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-Up (1998).

(18) LABOR LAWS.—The term “labor laws” means the statutes and regulations, or provisions thereof, of a party to the negotiations that are directly related to core labor standards as well as other labor protections for children and minors and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health, and for the United States, includes Federal statutes and regulations addressing those standards, protections, or conditions, but does not include State or local labor laws.

(19) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of the United States; and

(C) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of a foreign country and is controlled by entities described in subparagraph (B) or United States citizens, or both.

(20) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS.—The term “Uruguay Round Agreements” has the meaning given that term in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7)).

(21) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION; WTO.—The terms “World Trade Organization” and “WTO” mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(22) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term “WTO Agreement” means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(23) WTO MEMBER.—The term “WTO member” has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(10)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2146, Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Welcome back, everybody. I have to admit, I am a little disappointed that we are back here today. Last week, a bipartisan majority stepped up to pass trade promotion authority. That vote showed that Republicans and Democrats can still come together to do what is right for this country. It was a vote that I am very proud of.

Unfortunately, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle would not stand with their President and voted to sacrifice a program that they support—a program that they asked for—in order to block our path. It was disappointing, but we are not going to be discouraged. That is why we are back here today.

Enacting trade promotion authority is critical for our economy and our national security, and so we are going to get it done here today. Why do we need TPA? Well, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty easy, an easy question to answer—because we need more trade. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers don't live in America. They live in other countries. If we want to make more things here and sell them there, then we need to tear down those trade barriers that make American goods and services more expensive.

We know that trade is good for our economy. One in five jobs in America is already tied to trade, and they pay on average 18 percent more. We also need more trade to bolster our foreign policy and our national security. Stronger economic ties lead to stronger security ties. More market share means more influence. That is why so many national security voices, former military leaders, former Secretaries of Defense, former Secretaries of State have all called on Congress to pass TPA. They understand what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker.

What is at stake here is no less than America's credibility because the rules of the global economy are being written right now. The question is: Who is going to write those rules? Will it be the United States and our allies or will it be other nations that don't share our values or don't share our commitment to free enterprise and the rule of law?

Our friends in Asia and Europe are getting ready to place their bets. They want to sign up for American-style free enterprise, but they need to know that the United States is going to stand strong as a reliable ally, as a reliable trading partner before they do that. That is what TPA is all about.

So how does it work? We have heard all kinds of crazy misinformation spread by the opponents of trade. I mean, crazy stuff, really. Let me, one more time, explain what TPA is and what TPA is not. TPA is a process; it is not an agreement. It is a process that gives us the best shot at getting a good trade agreement. It is a process, dating back decades, that Congress has used to insert itself into trade negotiations

in order to provide more accountability and more transparency to the administration, to the President.

This TPA has more transparency and more accountability than any version ever before. It lays out 150 objectives and guidelines that the administration must follow while negotiating a trade deal. These are our priorities. If the President wants an agreement, then he must meet to address these priorities. He must meet these guidelines in order to get it passed through Congress.

This TPA also requires that the administration consults with Congress during the negotiations: Give us access to all of the text, provide timely briefings on demand, allow Members to attend the negotiating rounds as accredited advisers if they want to. If we are here in session, we can send our people. That is what the Zinke amendment accomplishes.

Finally, perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker, TPA ensures that the American people can read any trade agreement, every trade agreement long before anyone is asked to vote on it—60 days. An agreement must be made public and posted online for 60 days before it can even be sent to Congress. This turns fast track into slow track.

Mr. Speaker, it is transparency, it is effective oversight, and it is accountability because if the President doesn't meet these requirements or doesn't follow the negotiating objectives, we can turn TPA off for that agreement. We can cancel the vote, we can amend the agreement, or we can stop it entirely. So it is ultimately, we, Congress, we always have the final say. No agreement takes effect, no laws are changed unless we vote to allow it.

This process, TPA, creates a pact between Congress and the administration that allows our trading partners to know that we speak with one voice. It allows them to make their best efforts, knowing that as long as the administration follows TPA, Congress won't try to rewrite an agreement later. In other words, it gives America credibility, Mr. Speaker. And, boy, do we need credibility right now.

Make no mistake, all of my colleagues, make no mistake: the world is watching us; they are watching this vote. The foreign policy failures of the last few years, not to mention the stunt pulled here last week, have capitals all around the world wondering if America still has it. Are we still the leader? Are we still the Republic that other countries aspire to be? They want to know that we are still willing to engage, still willing to lead, that we are still a nation that is out front. Or are we in retreat and decline?

We are here today to answer that question again. America does not retreat; America leads. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for TPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that we should write the rules, not China. But make

no mistake, the "we" is not Congress, leaving us with only a "yes" or "no" vote at the very end. To vote for TPA now is to surrender congressional leverage. To get it right in shaping TPP, the most significant trade negotiation in decades, Congress will have settled for a bill with so-called congressional negotiating objectives so vague they are essentially meaningless.

That won't matter to those who basically approach trade with a 19th century dogma, that trade between any two nations will naturally be beneficial, simply matching the comparative economic advantages of each. But that has not worked out when, in this era, one nation manipulates its currency as it trades with the other, when nations suppress worker rights to keep their wages low, or degrade their environment to help them compete, or when nations heavily subsidize their markets or they keep their markets closed while their competitor keeps them very open in vital areas, whether industrial or agricultural.

So let us write the rules, but Congress must be sure they are right. We must make sure that the beneficiaries are the many in our Nation, not just the few.

As often stated in this debate, trade does, indeed, create winners and losers. As one who has worked hard to help put together expanded trade agreements, I know that in a globalizing world economy, failure to write the rules effectively is one of the reasons there have been too many losers. Millions of jobs lost, with middle class wages stagnant for decades, while the relative few have done so well.

Congress should not give what would be essentially a blank check to USTR on key outstanding issues in the TPP negotiations. With this TPA, you are saying "fine" to no meaningful currency provision. You are saying "fine" to giving private investors in growing numbers the ability to choose an unregulated arbitration panel instead of a well-established judicial system in order to overturn local or national health or environmental regulations. With this TPA, you cannot be confident Vietnam and Mexico will adhere to meaningful labor standards. With this TPA, you can't be confident that Japan will open its market at long last to our cars or agricultural products. With this TPA, you can't be confident that there will be access to lifesaving medicines.

Despite a bombardment of rhetoric, instead of the approach that we laid out in the substitute that we have not even been allowed to consider in the committee or in this House, the reality is that this TPA will not put Congress in the driver's seat, but the backseat, for TPP and for 6 years in important negotiations with Europe in TTIP and who knows what else. Congress has a responsibility to get trade negotiations on the right track, not the fast track. Vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a senior member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, free trade is economic freedom. It is the freedom to buy and sell and compete around the world with as little government interference as possible. It is really one of the great economic rights of every American. Given the choice between more economic freedom or less, we should always choose more. We know if America doesn't lead in free and fair trade, we will grow weaker and our foreign competitors will grow stronger, and our factories and farmers and manufacturers will be priced out and shut down.

Texas is made for trade. America is made for trade. It is time, through expanded trade, to preserve these economic principles that have helped us thrive and grow over the century. That is why Congress flexing its constitutional muscles and setting clear rules for future American trade is not just a good thing for America; it is a great thing.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of our caucus and a member of our committee.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this trade promotion authority legislation, as we have heard, is all about writing the rules, writing the rules on trade. It is about who will lead or who will retreat on assisting on free and fair trade.

This TPA legislation sets forward the instructions on how we will write the rules in any trade agreement. Okay. So who is going to lead in writing the rules? On currency manipulation, where countries, not just the companies, but the countries themselves that want to trade with us are cheating by manipulating their currency to make the value of their goods look less expensive than American products in the same area, when those countries are cheating, what are we going to say should be the rules when it comes to currency manipulation?

□ 1130

Under this TPA, we can't say anything because we are prohibited from including anything in a trade agreement that will deal with currency manipulation.

You then have to ask a second question. You are telling me that countries that are going to sign these deals are going to be allowed to cheat when it comes to how they manipulate their currency so their products will look cheaper than ours? We are supposed to depend on those same countries that are cheating to now enforce the rules in these agreements against companies in those countries that are cheating? What kind of instruction is that?

What about when it comes to letting people in America know what is in

these deals? What if we want to know where the products that are going to be bought and sold in our stores come from? Shouldn't we have the right, if we want, to know the country of origin of a particular product?

I have heard about tainted milk coming from places around the world. We have heard about toys that have dangerous chemicals in them that our kids play with. Don't we want to know where these products are coming from? That is all we are saying, just to know where they are coming from, not that we are going to degrade the place where they come from; we just want to know if it is made in the USA or made somewhere else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BECERRA. Under this TPA, we can't ask those questions. We won't be able to find out where a product is made because someone else—a tribunal, not an American court—will decide whether we can label a product as made in the USA or not.

Right now, these international tribunals that have no American jurists or judges sitting on them get to decide for us if Americans should have the right to know where a product is coming from that they are buying from a store in their neighborhood.

How does that lead to making sure trade is free and fair if we can't even put a label on a product coming from some other country that has in the past sent us tainted products?

We can do much better. We have over two or three decades of experience in writing trade deals. We know what works; we know what doesn't. The thing we know most is that enforcement is the most difficult aspect of trade because most companies in far-away places don't follow American law and American rules and they cheat and they think they think can get away with it.

We can do much better. Let's get a better trade deal that is free and fair. This TPA doesn't give us that. It doesn't give us the right rules. Reject this TPA legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last week, in a bipartisan majority, this House granted this administration trade promotion authority so that it can begin to elevate standards and level the playing field for our workers, our farmers, and our businesses so we can effectively compete in one of the fastest growing regions of the global economy.

It is time for us to move forward. I feel confident that, with the assurances that we received from the Republican leadership, this body will have another

opportunity to also pass Trade Adjustment Assistance so that the training programs and education for the workers who need it will be in place.

Out of consideration for some of our colleagues who are trying to get home to their communities today after last night's terrible shootings, I end by encouraging my colleagues to support this legislation. It is time for America to move on.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, if at first you don't succeed, try, try again. That seems to be the approach on trade.

Despite the fact that TPA passed the House last week by only eight votes, at no point did the lightbulb go off for the leadership that perhaps they could work with the majority of the Democratic Caucus to find agreement on how to move forward. I don't know why that didn't occur to you. Instead of cooperation, they have opted to use procedural tricks to pass the TPA.

The leadership has chosen to take a bipartisan bill passed by both Chambers of Congress that would aid our law enforcement officers and public safety workers and inject the unrelated, controversial trade debate into it. I can speak firsthand because I am one of the sponsors of the bill.

This bill, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act, I have worked on with my friend Congressman REICHERT, on behalf of the men and women who serve the public in physically demanding work each and every day.

It would ensure that they could access their full retirement benefits at the time they retire without incurring a tax penalty. It is a good bill. I am not only one of the sponsors, I vote for it.

Today, this bill to provide tax fairness for our law enforcement officers has been twisted and diminished to a convenient vehicle to ram through fast track for a deeply flawed trade bill.

This is not the same bill that we voted on Friday. Please read this bill. It is not. I urge a "no" vote.

In fact, Harold Schaitberger, president of the International Association of Fire Fighters, has written a letter urging Members to oppose attaching TPA to this bill.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would establish the biggest trade agreement we have seen in years, encompassing 40 percent of the world's economy. We need to take our time and do it right. In its current form, TPP is woefully inadequate and fails to ensure a fair deal for American workers.

Issues such as prohibiting currency manipulation and ensuring food safety have been neglected in TPP. As an example, only 1 percent of imported fish into this country—seafood—is inspected. I hope the next time you go into the restaurant, you ask the proprietor: Has this fish been inspected?

He will look at you like you have three heads. Isn't that interesting?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. This country got shafted with our deal with Korea on country of origin automobiles. You don't really see any more cars traveling through Korea—or certainly China—that are made in the United States of America. We are taking a backseat.

Instead of protecting the interests of American U.S. workers—not protectionism, we are not advocating that—this trade bill gives protections and sweetheart deals to multinational corporations, pure and simple. The American people look at every poll—from the left, from the right, from north, south, east, west—and do not accept this deal, and we shouldn't either.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was thinking what a difference a week does not make. The vast majority of the people in my congressional district were opposed to fast track last week, and they are even more opposed to fast track this week.

We have seen fast track before. We have seen the jobs leave our community, our district, our State, and our Nation fast enough. They don't need our help. They don't need anybody else's help. We need to create jobs here in America, not have them flee.

I agree with my colleagues who have said vote “no.” I agree with the people of my congressional district, and I shall vote “no.”

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support TPA to give the President the authority to negotiate this agreement. It is very simple. A lot of those countries are already able to send their goods into our country duty free. What we want to do is allow our exporting companies to be able to export to those countries duty free, also, so we can send our goods over there.

Look at what has happened in Texas. Texas exported more than \$289 billion last year, up 146 percent from 2004. Let's look at the number of companies that export. They are not the big companies. Ninety-three percent of those 40,737 exporting companies were small- and medium-sized businesses.

Again, Members, I ask you to please support TPA. It is good for Texas; it is good for the United States, and it is a no-brainer to allow us to export to those countries.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great Na-

tion are watching us today, and they are begging and pleading with us to please vote down this bill.

Who knows better than the American people who live in the towns and the cities where they have seen their manufacturing plants close and they have seen their jobs shipped overseas? Every trade deal has done it.

Let's look at the China deal. As a result of the China deal, 2 million manufacturing jobs have been shipped from America over to China.

Look at NAFTA. Yes, it created jobs; but where did they create jobs? They are in Mexico. Where did the manufacturing plants go? They went to Mexico.

That is why the American people are ringing everybody's office and urging them: Please let us not lose any more jobs.

Those of you who are concerned about income equality, the reason we have that as a burning issue in the heart and soul, particularly of middle class America, is because we are seeing the middle class vanish.

These are the jobs. These manufacturing jobs, ladies and gentlemen, are not where the big corporate presidents make millions of dollars. Yes, they are going to make plenty of millions of dollars; but these jobs go into the middle section of our economic stream and the lower income.

Look at Akron, Ohio; look at Atlanta, Georgia; look at Chicago; look at Detroit. They were once vibrant cities. The backbone of America is manufacturing, and we are shipping it out to the world.

You know what else we are shipping out there? We are shipping these jobs—not only that, the profits of these companies. Last year, \$2 trillion of profits were held in these overseas accounts, away from our taxing structure.

Can't you see America is getting weaker because of these trade policies? I urge you to vote “no” and stand up for the American people for a change.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the ranking member for yielding and, once again, for his tremendous leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill and to once again say “no” to fast track. This legislation cynically uses a bill that would exempt retired Federal police officers and firefighters from paying a penalty on withdrawals from their retirement accounts if they retire after the age of 50. What does that have to do with fast track? Absolutely nothing—this is just plain wrong.

What is more, we know now that the Senate is considering attaching the Trade Adjustment Assistance, or TAA, to the recently passed African Growth and Accountability Act, better known as AGOA, as a means to get this flawed trade package passed.

That is why yesterday, my colleagues Congressional Black Caucus Chair Congressman BUTTERFIELD, Congress-

woman KAREN BASS, Congressman KEITH ELLISON, and myself sent a letter to the Senate leadership expressing our opposition to what they are trying to do in using AGOA as a bargaining chip.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER REID: We write to urge you to expeditiously pass H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, without attaching unrelated amendments. If passed, the bill would go to the President and reauthorize the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGO) until the end of FY 2025.

AGO is too important to be used as a bargaining chip to pass unrelated trade legislation. As you know, AGO is not controversial and passed out of the House of Representatives with almost 400 votes. AGO is a trade preference program that is usually noncontroversial, and thus voice voted. It is the centerpiece of relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa. Though a small percentage of overall trade by the United States, AGO has helped enhance trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

In its current form, AGO expires September 30, 2015. It is imperative that the Senate move H.R. 1295 along to reauthorize the program soon. Delays will not only negatively affect global supply chains, but also adversely affect the livelihoods of individuals whose jobs come from AGO.

The House has already passed H.R. 1295 to reauthorize AGO. We urge the Senate to follow suit without delay and send the bill to President Obama's desk.

Sincerely,

GK BUTTERFIELD,  
Member of Congress,  
KAREN BASS,  
Member of Congress,  
BARBARA LEE,  
Member of Congress,  
KEITH ELLISON,  
Member of Congress.

Ms. LEE. AGO is a growth and trade act. That is a trade preference program that has helped enhance trade investment and job creation to democratic institutions throughout Africa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LEE. In no way should that be used as a bargaining chip on this bill. It is outrageous. Members should not have to choose between programs that they support, like TAA and AGO, and then supporting fast track.

These procedural gimmicks are outrageous, and they are fundamentally dishonest. If Members fall for this maneuver, we not only risk imperiling the TAA, a program that many of our constituents rely on, but also AGO.

We have got to vote “no” on this bill, “no” to attaching TAA to AGO. Let's get back to the drawing board and come up with a real fair, free, and transparent trade bill.

□ 1145

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if you vote for this bill, you get fast track without Trade Adjustment Assistance. There is no assurance Trade Adjustment Assistance will come to this floor or that it will come to this floor in a form that either Republicans or Democrats will support.

The supporters of this deal can't make their case without repeating demonstrably false statistics. The fact is we won a \$177 billion trade deficit in goods with the countries with which we have free trade agreements. The \$75 billion surplus in services brings the net to over a \$100 billion deficit.

How have so many Members been misled by charlatan lobbyists into coming to this floor and giving false statistics? They are given this slippery phrase: Go down to the floor and talk

about what has happened since NAFTA.

Now, "since NAFTA" usually sounds like, well, since the early 1990s. What they mean is excluding NAFTA. Excluding NAFTA when we review free trade agreements is like excluding LeBron James when you evaluate the Cavaliers.

This bill is catastrophic for our national security. It hollows out our manufacturing base, and it is the greatest gift to China that we could possibly make because it enshrines the sacrosanct nature of currency manipulation. It says, in the future, countries can manipulate their currency all they want and there will be no accounting for it.

In addition, the rules of origin provisions allow goods that are admitted to be 50 or 60 percent made in China—that are actually 70 or 80 percent made in China—to get fast-tracked into the United States. So China gets 80 percent of the benefit of this agreement with-

out having to admit a single American export.

As for Vietnam, our workers are going to have to compete against 56-cent-an-hour labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHERMAN. We are told that we will get free access to the Vietnamese markets. Vietnam doesn't have freedom. Vietnam doesn't have markets. They are not going to buy our exports any more than their Communist Party decides to do so.

The chairman points out that with trade comes influence. That is right. There will be Nike lobbyists here, financed by this bill and its effects, lobbying against going after Vietnam for its oppression of religion and its oppression of unions. So they will have influence here in Washington. They will continue not to have freedom, and we will continue to lose jobs.

THE TRADE DEFICIT WITH FTA PARTNERS  
MERCHANDISE TRADE BALANCE WITH FTA COUNTRIES  
(In thousands of dollars)

Country	U.S. Domestic Exports 2014	U.S. Imports for Consumption 2014	2014 Balance
Australia .....	24,460,776	10,846,176	13,614,600
Bahrain .....	996,619	930,049	66,570
Canada .....	262,930,650	345,304,263	-82,373,613
Chile .....	15,311,892	9,501,206	5,810,686
Colombia .....	18,313,501	17,162,947	1,150,554
Costa Rica .....	6,289,716	9,493,622	-3,203,906
Dominican Rep .....	7,218,421	4,462,740	2,755,681
El Salvador .....	3,062,786	2,390,272	672,514
Guatemala .....	5,653,385	4,140,518	1,512,867
Honduras .....	5,686,432	4,511,855	1,174,577
Israel .....	7,894,126	23,054,059	-15,159,933
Jordan .....	1,971,195	1,354,296	616,899
Korea .....	42,010,900	68,602,393	-26,591,493
Mexico .....	192,706,833	292,481,624	-99,774,791
Morocco .....	2,044,141	1,010,429	1,033,712
Nicaragua .....	905,977	3,079,467	-2,173,490
Oman .....	1,911,822	974,788	937,034
Panama .....	9,737,362	386,123	9,351,239
Peru .....	8,891,414	6,029,607	2,861,807
Singapore .....	26,468,896	16,259,527	10,209,369
Total .....	644,466,844	821,975,961	-177,509,117

#### SERVICES TRADE BALANCE WITH FTA COUNTRIES

According to the Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis, we ran a surplus in services of \$75 billion with FTA Countries as of 2013, the last year for which we have data on our services trade broken down for the FTA countries as a group. Assuming normal growth for 2014, our surplus in services is roughly \$77 billion.

Therefore, our TOTAL TRADE BALANCE with FTA partner countries is just over \$100 billion. We run a significant deficit with FTA Countries.

Explanation: There are different methods for measuring the trade balance of the United States. The table above uses the most accurate data for measuring the value of goods (merchandise) actually "Made in the USA" and exported from the United States to the various countries listed. The source for our goods data is the International Trade Commission (ITC) databweb, available at <http://dataweb.usitc.gov>. ITC measures exports in two different ways ("Total Exports" and "Domestic Exports").

We use "Domestic Exports." According to the ITC, "Domestic Exports measures goods that are grown, produced and manufactured in the United States, or goods of foreign origin that have been changed in the United States." FTA proponents like to use an alternative measurement, "Total Exports," which "measures the total movement of goods out of the United States to foreign

countries," whether those goods were made or altered by U.S. workers in the United States or not—it includes goods that were simply transiting the United States without alteration. Counting these "Re-Exports" that are included in the "Total Exports" measurement will give a distorted bilateral trade balance for given countries because it drastically over-counts exports. For similar reasons and in order to give an accurate, apples to apples comparison, on the import side we use "Imports for Consumption" which includes only imports that are not re-exported. Using the alternative ITC measurement for imports, "Total Imports," would overstate imports by counting those goods coming into the United States that are going to be re-exported. See <http://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/tradestatsnote.pdf> for more on these terms and what the measurements represent.

Services data. Ideally our nation's trade balance figures would provide the trade balance for both goods and services. However, services are more difficult for government agencies to track, and the agencies therefore do not break the trade data down consistently for every partner country, every year. Also, the agencies cannot compile services data as quickly as merchandise data. We use a 2013 services balance figure for FTA countries in the aggregate that the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis provided to the Chamber of Commerce for a

report touting FTAs. We assume growth of about \$5 billion in the positive services balance for 2014. See the Chamber report for these services data at [https://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/open\\_door\\_trade\\_report.pdf](https://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/open_door_trade_report.pdf).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. How much time remains for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 22½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We are the only two speakers left on our side. Because of deference to our Members from South Carolina who are trying to get home to this tragedy, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), and then I am just going to hold to close just for our South Carolina Members.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, read the bill. I have got it right here. The only thing different is the number at the top has changed. The content is the same.



TPA is not a trade deal. It is a process that holds this President accountable. It sets in motion Congress inserting itself.

By the way, NAFTA, I mean, I just continue to get blown away by the misinformation. No wonder the American people get confused.

I take this personally. As the gentleman from New Jersey knows, my dad lost his job way before NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in manufacturing with NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in services with NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in agriculture, food, and beverages with NAFTA. In fact, we have a trade surplus with NAFTA, if you take out oil and energy products. We have a trade surplus in manufacturing with NAFTA. I do get fired up about this.

Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of the world's population is outside the United States. A multinational corporation can move anywhere it wants to, a Fortune 500 company can move anywhere it wants to, and they do.

Lake Shore, in my district, a family-owned business, they cannot. This is about breaking down barriers for Lake Shore, for Screen Machine, because they can't move a plant overseas, and they are at a competitive disadvantage. A large corporation can move. They can't.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is about jobs. This is about the American worker. This is about the fact that we have the ability today to complete anywhere in the world if those trade barriers are broken down.

We have to break them down, Mr. Speaker. One out of every five jobs is trade-related. They are good jobs.

Vote "yes" on TPA. Vote "yes" for the American worker.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke in favor of H.R. 1891, the AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015. In the middle of tremendous controversy and tension over TPA, it was encouraging to have legislation that wasn't controversial, in fact, had overwhelming support with 397 votes. The bill was sent to the Senate, and we were hopeful that H.R. 1891 would have already made it to the President's desk.

Unfortunately, the bill is a victim of its own success. So many rumors are floating around that because AGOA is popular, supported by both Democrats, Republicans, Senators, and House Members, that now Senators are considering adding more controversial bills into AGOA.

We are hearing TAA might be added. The press is even reporting consideration is being given to using AGOA as a vehicle to extend the Ex-Im Bank. We hear the thinking is, if TAA failed in the House last week, if it is added in to AGOA, we will all vote for it.

AGOA can and should and stand on its own. The Senate should pass AGOA and send it to the President.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, once again, we are being asked to vote for an agreement that will cost jobs, undermine environmental protections, and erode workers' rights, all in the name of so-called free trade.

This agreement is being negotiated in the dark, behind closed doors. That secretive process may benefit large, multinational companies and their lobbyists, but it does not help small manufacturers in Brooklyn. It does nothing for New Yorkers struggling to raise a family while keeping their jobs from being exported.

When there is a bad process, we end up with a bad deal for American workers, and we have seen this in the past. New York lost 374,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA and the World Trade Organization agreements.

This vote, Mr. Speaker, comes down to a simple question: Are you going to side with Wall Street, large corporations, and their lobbyists, or will you stand with working families in your district? I will take the latter.

Vote "no."

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in Washington we never seem to lack for self-certified smart people. They are the folks who know what is best for you and your family.

While they, today, are insisting on railroading through this fast-track trade deal—and they say it is so sweet for working families—is it so unreasonable to ask: What do the workers think about this bill?

While the environmental provisions have been secreted away from the public, we do know that USTR does not believe in environmental law enforcement. Is it unreasonable to stop and ask: What do those who advocate for clean water and clean air and conservation of our resources think about this trade deal?

I believe they support fair trade. They recognize that it raises all boats, but unfair trade sinks too many of them. They are capsized by competing with those who pay an average minimum wage of 60 cents an hour and whose only worker organization is the Communist Party in Vietnam.

I believe our workers deserve respect. This bill asks American businesses to go out and compete with countries that mistreat their workers, that pollute their air and water and destroy their natural resources, and that deflate or adjust their currency, manipulating it in ways that are unfair.

Railroading this bill through today will deny any opportunity, which we have struggled so long for so many months to try to achieve to make this a better right-track bill. The fast-trackers have rejected every constructive improvement that we have offered

to this measure. And all of us here in Congress have to concede we know less about what is in this trade bill than the Vietnamese Politburo, than the Malaysian Government that has countenanced sex trafficking.

We need an open, fair process to advance real trade opportunities for all families. Reject this fast track.

Mr. LEVIN. We had one additional speaker. I don't see her, so I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I started off by saying it is said we should write the rules, not China. That is true. We have been striving to try to help write the rules. We did so for years.

We introduced a substitute bill that outlined where we were coming from and where we thought these negotiations should go. That wasn't even given time for discussion.

So here is what we are left with. When you vote for TPA under these circumstances, essentially what we are saying to this administration, it is essentially a blank check. They may talk. They may let us see some of the documents, but often in ways we can't discuss them publicly.

This is likely to add up to a TPP that will be even more controversial than this TPA. For that reason, I strongly urge that, as was said earlier, we slow down this process in order to try to find a route to a TPP that would have broad bipartisan support. That has always been my aim, rather than this kind of vote with a few handfuls of Democratic votes making this far, far, far from a bipartisan vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

For those who are coming on the floor protesting this particular process from the minority, it is the stunt pulled last week that brought about this process.

We have talked a lot about what TPA is. It is a process, not a trade agreement.

I want every Member in this body to think about what this vote represents. It is one that will speak loudly about our political system: Can it still work?

It is a vote about what kind of Congress we want to be: Will we empower ourselves in trade agreements or just let the administration do whatever it wants?

It is a vote about what kind of country we want to have: Are we still committed to leading? Are we still the symbol of freedom in free enterprise?

Mr. Speaker, this is a vote for accountability and for transparency. This is a vote for a stronger economy and higher wages. This is a vote for our system of free enterprise. This is a vote for American leadership. This is a vote to declare that America still has it. This is a vote to reestablish America's credibility.

The world is watching. Vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2146, the Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015. For the past several



years I have had many conversations about trade with the people of Northwest Oregon. I've spoken with farmers, environmentalists, semiconductor manufacturers, wine makers, workers, sports and outdoor apparel employees, and others.

The district I represent has many trade-dependent jobs and industries. We export a broad array of products—from computer chips to potato chips. Last year in Oregon, nearly 6,000 Oregon companies exported more than \$20 billion in products. Expanding the overseas markets for U.S. goods will help businesses expand in this country. Trade agreements done right make it easier to sell American-made goods and they level the playing field by reducing tariffs that currently make it difficult for Oregonians to compete in many of the world's markets.

This legislation is not the trade agreement itself, but rather a bill through which Congress establishes requirements for the negotiation of trade agreements and the procedure for Congress to use when voting on whether to approve the agreement when it is final.

The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act earned my vote because it requires the President to negotiate a trade agreement that includes strong and enforceable labor and environmental standards, fosters innovation, would help expand exports, provides transparency for the American people, and guarantees a meaningful role for Congress in trade negotiations.

I strongly support the rights of workers and their ability to collectively bargain and work in a safe environment. I also oppose child labor and forced labor. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act raises the bar in these areas and includes provisions that require trading partners to comply with internationally-accepted labor standards and face trade sanctions if they do not. For the first time it includes human rights—one of the cornerstones of our democratic values—as a negotiating objective. Oregon's First Congressional District is known for its natural treasures—from the Pacific Ocean to the Columbia River to the Clatsop State Forest—and it is imperative that they be preserved for future generations. Deciding between conserving our natural resources and growing our economy is a false choice; we can and must do both. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act ensures that our clean air, land, and water will not be up for negotiation.

The bill also protects intellectual property to safeguard innovation and fight piracy overseas, but with provisions to ensure that those protections will not impede access to much-needed medicines for people in developing countries.

The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act requires trade agreements to contain high standards and protections, and it also requires that the agreements include strong enforcement provisions to make clear that the standards and protections will be upheld and enforced.

It is important to my constituents that any trade agreement be accessible and transparent to the public. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act includes unprecedented access to trade agreements; the entire final agreement must be made available to the public for a minimum of 60 days before the President signs it. In addition, after the full text of the trade agreement becomes public, there

will still be months before Congress votes on whether to approve it.

To earn my vote, any trade agreement must be good for Americans. The jobs we gain by expanding exports tend to pay high wages, but there is a risk that some workers may be displaced by trade and by globalization. Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) is an important program to help workers transition into new fields by investing in skills and worker retraining. Without a reauthorization, TAA will expire at the end of September 2015. I voted in favor of TAA last week, but unfortunately it did not pass. But let me be very clear, I voted for the TPA again today because the Speaker, the Senate Majority Leader, and the President have committed that Trade Adjustment Assistance and customs enforcement legislation will also move forward without delay.

I was deeply concerned that an early version of TAA legislation included cuts to Medicare. Seniors serve our country, contribute to our economy, raise families, and strengthen communities across the nation. I urged House leadership to eliminate this provision. The bill I voted for did not cut Medicare and I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure seniors are not singled out to pay for this program.

This trade package, however, is far from perfect, and as we move forward I will continue to work to pass TAA and improve the trade agreement. I am very disappointed that partisan language to tie the administration's hands on climate change was inserted at the last minute into the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act, which passed the House of Representatives last week without my support. I am also very concerned that two very smart enforcement provisions offered by my colleague from Oregon, Representative EARL BLUMENAUER, were deleted. His "Green 301" and enforcement fund provisions were very important to the overall effectiveness of the customs bill, and I will encourage the conferees to insist upon their inclusion in the bill we ultimately send to the President's desk for signature.

We live in a changing and global economy. Markets, industries, and technologies evolve and American businesses and workers need to be able to react and adapt to thrive. A 21st century trade agreement broadens our country's reach and, done right, leads to more opportunity, more growth, and more job creation. It also supports the principle of trade according to fair rules, equally applied, as opposed to all parties doing whatever they want on a playing field that is far from level.

I am committed to policies that support a strong, long-term economy for hardworking Oregonians and Americans. A trade agreement done right can help achieve this goal, and passing H.R. 2146 is an important step in this process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of H.R. 160.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

#### AYES—218

Abraham	Grothman	Polis
Allen	Guinta	Pompeo
Amodei	Guthrie	Price, Tom
Ashford	Hanna	Quigley
Babin	Hardy	Ratcliffe
Barletta	Harper	Reed
Barr	Hartzler	Reichert
Barton	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Benishek	Hensarling	Ribble
Bera	Herrera Beutler	Rice (NY)
Beyer	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Hill	Rigell
Bishop (MI)	Himes	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hinojosa	Roe (TN)
Black	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Huelskamp	Rokita
Blumenauer	Huizenga (MI)	Rooney (FL)
Boehner	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonamici	Hurd (TX)	Roskam
Bost	Hurt (VA)	Ross
Boustany	Issa	Rouzer
Brady (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Royce
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Ryan (WI)
Buchanan	Johnson, E. B.	Salmon
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Calvert	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Kilmer	Schrader
Carter (TX)	Kind	Schweikert
Chabot	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Sessions
Cole	Kline	Sewell (AL)
Comstock	Knight	Shimkus
Conaway	LaMalfa	Shuster
Connolly	Lamborn	Simpson
Cooper	Lance	Smith (MO)
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Latta	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Long	Stefanik
Crawford	Loudermilk	Stewart
Crenshaw	Love	Stivers
Cuellar	Lucas	Stutzman
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	Marchant	Thornberry
Davis (CA)	Marino	Tiberti
Delaney	McCarthy	Tipton
DelBene	McCaul	Trott
Denham	McClintock	Turner
Dent	McHenry	Upton
DeSantis	McMorris	Valadao
DesJarlais	Rodgers	Wagner
Diaz-Balart	McSally	Walberg
Dold	Meehan	Walden
Duffy	Meeks	Walker
Ellmers (NC)	Messer	Walorski
Emmer (MN)	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Farr	Miller (FL)	Wasserman
Fincher	Miller (MI)	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Mullin	Wenstrup
Flores	Murphy (PA)	Westerman
Forbes	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Newhouse	Williams
Fox	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Nunes	Womack
Frelinghuysen	O'Rourke	Woodall
Gibbs	Olson	Yoder
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Yoho
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (IA)
Granger	Peters	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Pittenger	Zinke
Graves (LA)	Pitts	
Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)	

#### NOES—208

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Buck
Aderholt	F.	Burgess
Aguilar	Brady (PA)	Bustos
Amash	Brat	Butterfield
Bass	Bridenstine	Capps
Beatty	Brooks (AL)	Capuano
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Cárdenas
Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Carney

Carson (IN)      Huffman  
 Cartwright      Hunter  
 Castor (FL)      Israel  
 Castro (TX)      Jackson Lee  
 Chu, Judy      Jeffries  
 Cicilline      Jenkins (WV)  
 Clark (MA)      Johnson (GA)  
 Clarke (NY)      Jones  
 Clawson (FL)      Jordan  
 Clay      Joyce  
 Cleaver      Kaptur  
 Cohen      Katko  
 Collins (GA)      Keating  
 Collins (NY)      Kelly (IL)  
 Conyers      Kennedy  
 Cook      Kildee  
 Courtney      Kirkpatrick  
 Crowley      Kuster  
 Cummings      Labrador  
 Davis, Danny      Langevin  
 DeFazio      Larson (CT)  
 DeGette      Lawrence  
 DeLauro      Lee  
 DeSaulnier      Levin  
 Deutch      Lewis  
 Dingell      Lieu, Ted  
 Doggett      Liepinski  
 Donovan      LoBiondo  
 Doyle, Michael F.      Loeb sack  
                          Lofgren  
 Duckworth      Lowenthal  
 Duncan (SC)      Lowey  
 Duncan (TN)      Lujan Grisham  
 Edwards      (NM)  
 Ellison      Luján, Ben Ray  
 Engel      (NM)  
 Eshoo      Lummis  
 Esty      Lynch  
 Farenthold      MacArthur  
 Fattah      Maloney,  
 Fleming      Carolyn  
 Foster      Maloney, Sean  
 Frankel (FL)      Massie  
 Fudge      Matsui  
 Gabbard      McCollum  
 Gallego      McDermott  
 Garamendi      McGovern  
 Garrett      McKinley  
 Gibson      McNeerney  
 Gohmert      Meadows  
 Graham      Meng  
 Grayson      Mooney (WV)  
 Green, Al      Moore  
 Green, Gene      Moulton  
 Griffith      Mulvaney  
 Grijalva      Murphy (FL)  
 Gutiérrez      Nadler  
 Hahn      Napolitano  
 Harris      Neal  
 Hastings      Nolan  
 Heck (WA)      Norcross  
 Higgins      Nugent  
 Honda      Pallone  
 Hoyer      Palmer

## NOT VOTING—8

Byrne      Gosar      Payne  
 Clyburn      Jolly      Young (AK)  
 Davis, Rodney      Kelly (MS)

## □ 1225

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 374 I would have voted “no” on passage. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 374 I intended to vote “no.”

# PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the passage of the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.  
 This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 140, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

## YEAS—280

Abraham      Gohmert      Mullin  
 Aderholt      Goodlatte      Mulvaney  
 Aguilar      Gowdy      Murphy (FL)  
 Allen      Graham      Murphy (PA)  
 Amash      Granger      Neugebauer  
 Amodei      Graves (GA)      Newhouse  
 Ashford      Graves (LA)      Noem  
 Babin      Graves (MO)      Nolan  
 Barletta      Green, Gene      Norcross  
 Barr      Griffith      Nugent  
 Barton      Grothman      Nunes  
 Benishek      Guinta      Olson  
 Bera      Guthrie      Palazzo  
 Bilirakis      Hanna      Palmer  
 Bishop (GA)      Hardy      Paulsen  
 Bishop (MI)      Harper      Pearce  
 Bishop (UT)      Harris      Perry  
 Black      Hartzer      Peters  
 Blackburn      Heck (NV)      Peterson  
 Blum      Hensarling      Pittenger  
 Bost      Herrera Beutler      Pitts  
 Boustany      Hice, Jody B.      Pollinquin  
 Boyle, Brendan F.      Higgins      Pompeo  
 Brady (TX)      Hill      Posey  
 Brat      Holding      Price, Tom  
 Bridenstine      Hudson      Ratcliffe  
 Brooks (AL)      Huelskamp      Reed  
 Brooks (IN)      Huizenga (MI)      Reichert  
 Brownley (CA)      Hultgren      Renacci  
 Buchanan      Hunter      Ribble  
 Hurd (TX)      Hurd (TX)      Rice (SC)  
 Buck      Hurt (VA)      Rigell  
 Bucshon      Issa      Roby  
 Burgess      Jenkins (KS)      Roe (TN)  
 Bustos      Jenkins (WV)      Rogers (AL)  
 Calvert      Johnson (OH)      Rohrabacher  
 Cárdenas      Johnson, Sam      Rokita  
 Carter (GA)      Jones      Rooney (FL)  
 Carter (TX)      Jordan      Ros-Lehtinen  
 Chabot      Joyce      Roskam  
 Chaffetz      Katko      Ross  
 Clark (MA)      Keating      Rothfus  
 Clawson (FL)      Kelly (PA)      Rouzer  
 Coffman      Kilmer      Royce  
 Cole      King (NY)      Ruiz  
 Collins (GA)      Kinzinger (IL)      Russell  
 Collins (NY)      Kirkpatrick      Ryan (WI)  
 Comstock      Kline      Salmon  
 Conaway      Knight      Sanchez, Loretta  
 Cook      Kuster      Sanford  
 Costello (PA)      Labrador      Scalise  
 Cramer      Lamborn      Schweikert  
 Crawford      Lance      Scott, Austin  
 Crenshaw      Latta      Scott, David  
 Cuellar      Lieu, Ted      Sensenbrenner  
 Culberson      Lipinski      Sessions  
 Curbelo (FL)      LoBiondo      Sewell (AL)  
 Davis (CA)      Loeb sack      Shimkus  
 DelBene      Long      Shuster  
 Denham      Loudermill      Simpson  
 Dent      Love      Sinema  
 DeSantis      Lucas      Smith (MO)  
 DesJarlais      Luetkemeyer      Smith (NE)  
 Diaz-Balart      Lummis      Smith (NJ)  
 Dold      Lynch      Smith (TX)  
 Donovan      MacArthur      Speier  
 Duckworth      Maloney, Sean      Stefanik  
 Duffy      Marchant      Stewart  
 Duncan (SC)      Marino      Stivers  
 Duncan (TN)      Massie      Stutzman  
 Ellmers (NC)      McCarthy      Swalwell (CA)  
 Emmer (MN)      McCaul      Thompson (PA)  
 Farenthold      McClintock      Thornberry  
 Fattah      McHenry      Tiberi  
 Fitzpatrick      McKinley      Tipton  
 Fleischmann      McMorris      Titus  
 Fleming      Rodgers      Tonko  
 Flores      McNeerney      Torres  
 Forbes      McSally      Trott  
 Fortenberry      Meadows      Turner  
 Foxx      Meehan      Upton  
 Franks (AZ)      Mica      Valadao  
 Frelinghuysen      Miller (FL)      Vargas  
 Gabbard      Miller (MI)      Wagner  
 Garrett      Moolenaar      Walberg  
 Gibbs      Mooney (WV)      Walden  
 Gibson      Moulton      Walker

Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Walz  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman

Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall

## NAYS—140

Adams      Gallego      Neal  
 Bass      Garamendi      O'Rourke  
 Beatty      Grayson      Pallone  
 Becerra      Green, Al      Pascrell  
 Beyer      Grijalva      Payne  
 Blumenauer      Gutiérrez      Pelosi  
 Bonamici      Hahn      Perlmutter  
 Brady (PA)      Hastings      Pingree  
 Brown (FL)      Heck (WA)      Pocan  
 Butterfield      Himes      Polis  
 Capps      Hinojosa      Price (NC)  
 Capuano      Honda      Quigley  
 Carney      Hoyer      Rangel  
 Carson (IN)      Huffman      Rice (NY)  
 Cartwright      Israel      Richmond  
 Castor (FL)      Jackson Lee      Roybal-Allard  
 Castro (TX)      Jeffries      Ruppersberger  
 Chu, Judy      Johnson (GA)      Rush  
 Cicilline      Johnson, E. B.      Ryan (OH)  
 Clay      Kelly (IL)      Sánchez, Linda  
 Cleaver      Kennedy      T.  
 Cohen      Kildee      Sarbanes  
 Connolly      Kind      Schakowsky  
 Conyers      Langevin      Schiff  
 Cooper      Larsen (WA)      Schrader  
 Costa      Larson (CT)      Scott (VA)  
 Courtney      Lawrence      Serrano  
 Crowley      Lee      Sherman  
 Cummings      Levin      Sires  
 Davis, Danny      Lewis      Slaughter  
 DeFazio      Lofgren      Smith (WA)  
 DeGette      Lowenthal      Takai  
 DeLauro      Lowey      Takano  
 DeSaulnier      Lujan Grisham      Thompson (CA)  
 Deutch      (NM)      Thompson (MS)  
 Dingell      Luján, Ben Ray      Tsongas  
 Doggett      (NM)      Van Hollen  
 Doyle, Michael F.      Maloney, Carolyn      Veasey  
                          Vela  
 Edwards      Matsui      Velázquez  
 Ellison      McCollum      Visclosky  
 Engel      McDermott      Wasserman  
 Eshoo      McGovern      Schultz  
 Esty      Meeks      Waters, Maxine  
 Farr      Meng      Watson Coleman  
 Foster      Moore      Welch  
 Frankel (FL)      Nadler      Wilson (FL)  
 Fudge      Napolitano      Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—13

## □ 1233

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375 I was unavoidably detained and missed the recorded vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375 I was detained with constituents including a World War II veteran and family visiting in the U.S. Capitol for the first time and missed rollcall No. 375. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall No. 375. Had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 375, I would have voted “aye.”

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 18, 2015, I was absent

from the House for family medical reasons. Due to my absence, I did not record any votes for the day.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 373, rollcall 374, and rollcall 375.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act, sponsored by Representative ED WHITFIELD. This bill is essential for families all across the Nation. If we do not act, the electricity bills could skyrocket as a result of EPA's clean power plan rule.

The House will also continue the annual appropriations process with consideration of fiscal year 2016 Interior appropriation bill sponsored by Representative KEN CALVERT.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I note that the Export-Import Bank, which, of course, expires on June 30, is not among the scheduled pieces of legislation.

As the gentleman knows, Speaker BOEHNER has been quoted as saying that, if we don't pass the Export-Import Bank, that there are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear. He then again said, as the Chamber closest to the people, "The House works best when it is allowed to work its will."

The majority leader knows that I am absolutely convinced that the Export-Import Bank is supported by a majority of Members of this House, but this House has not been allowed to work its will on the Export-Import Bank.

Predecessors of yours and a very dear friend of mine, Senator BLUNT, said not too long ago that he believed that, if a bill were brought to the floor of the House, it would have the votes. More importantly, because he is now, of course, in the other body but is among

the leadership in the other body, he said that the bill had the votes in the Senate. I believe he is right on both of those observations.

I understand the majority leader is not for the bill. It is my understanding that the Speaker is. I would hope that those of us who support it and, frankly, those who oppose it would have the opportunity, as the Speaker indicated, for the House to work its will.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there are any plans prior to June 30, when the Export-Import Bank authorization to give loans expires, are there any plans to bring that legislation before this House in a timely fashion so that the authorization would not expire?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman did say he knows my stance on this issue; and, no, there is no action scheduled before the House.

Mr. HOYER. I apologize. Could the gentleman repeat himself?

Mr. MCCARTHY. There is no action scheduled for this House, no.

Mr. HOYER. Does the majority leader intend to, therefore, have the authority of the Export-Import Bank expire, notwithstanding the Speaker's observation and that it will cost thousands of jobs?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is no action scheduled at this appropriate time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating his answer. I heard that answer, but my question to the gentleman was: Is it his intention that the Export-Import Bank expire and, therefore, not bring legislation to the floor?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding for the third time with the same question.

There is no pending action before this House for next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating for a third time his answer to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply observe, sadly, that the representation the House can work its will on an issue of great importance to the United States and to jobs in the United States will not be brought to this floor, notwithstanding the fact that 180 Democrats have signed a discharge petition and 60 Republicans filed a bill to extend the Export-Import Bank.

That is 240 votes, Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker well can add himself. Two hundred and forty votes is a majority of this House. They reflect in my view, Mr. Speaker, the will of this House.

It is extraordinarily regrettable that, when the Speaker of the House says that, if we don't do something, thousands of American jobs are going to be lost—it is particularly regrettable, just after we had a vote on a bill that many people believe is going to lose us jobs and, therefore, they opposed.

How sad it is that we don't bring to the floor a bill which will, like 85 other

countries—85 other countries—help us export goods? Those 85 countries, Mr. Speaker, are not going to stop helping their countries export goods, so the loss will be to our exporters and those they employ.

I very much regret that that won't be brought to the floor. As the majority has told me, it is not scheduled; I know it is not scheduled. I lament the fact that it is not scheduled.

Representative CHRIS COLLINS of New York said: I can't figure out for the life of me why my party, the Republican Party, that stands for jobs, and in every conference meeting, it is jobs and the economy.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is on the floor; he talks about jobs and the economy.

Here I am, says CHRIS COLLINS, in the majority of my own Conference, fighting to defend the Export-Import Bank, which is the best example of creating jobs in America.

I regret that that is not being brought to the floor. I won't ask the question again because he has already told me it is not scheduled, and apparently, there is no intent to schedule. I regret that.

Now, Mr. Leader, if I can ask you, we passed now six appropriations bills. Yesterday, the Labor, HHS bill was marked up in subcommittee and the Financial Services in full committee.

Can the gentleman tell me whether it is the intention, whether they are scheduled right now or not, to bring all 12 appropriations bills to the floor before—well, whenever—all 12 bills to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1245

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, this is the earliest we have ever started the appropriation process. The gentleman is correct that we are halfway through the 12 bills, having passed 6 already, and we are bringing up Interior next week. It is our intention to do the work that we are responsible for in finishing the appropriation process.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

Let me ask him further as he knows what is happening in the Senate and whether they can take those bills up: Does the gentleman contemplate, as the majority leader, or does he know whether the Speaker contemplates any effort to come to a bipartisan agreement as was done when Mr. RYAN and Senator MURRAY met and came to grips with a resolution and a compromise on what otherwise would be the sequester 302(a) allocations on discretionary spending, which the chair of the committee, as you know, Chairman ROGERS, has called ill-conceived and unrealistic?

Does the majority leader know whether there is any plan to try to get us from the gridlock, which we are apparently in one more time on the appropriations process, to a place as

Ryan-Murray got us where we moved ahead in a bipartisan way and, in fact, funded the government?

Although, it was not until December, and we had a stopgap measure in there. Is there anything scheduled to discuss that or to pursue that compromise?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, there is no gridlock here. We have passed half of the appropriation bills already. We have started the process earlier than ever before. As the gentleman knows, with just the bill before—very bipartisan—more than 46 Democrats joined us in repealing the medical device tax.

I would probably tell the gentleman that his question really goes to the minority leader on the Senate side, HARRY REID. In reading some of his statements, he wants to create a shutdown, which I think would be wrong for the American people.

I think the best way forward is for the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate to take up DOD appropriations and move that to the President's desk.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend.

There is no Democrat in this House, in the Senate, or in the White House who wants to shut down this government. As a matter of fact, we have not done that. It was done in '95 and in early '96. It was done last year when many in your party said "shut it down" if the President doesn't change his immigration policy. Any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats want to shut down the government is simply incorrect.

Now, what the minority leader has said in the Senate, I believe, is that, until such time as sequester is changed that it is not useful to waste time on bills that will not become law as we did, of course, many years during the Ryan budgets, which were never implemented, and they were never implemented in the House of Representatives fully—not once. Why? It is because, as Mr. ROGERS said, they were ill-conceived and unrealistic.

I just want to make it clear to the majority leader that I am prepared to work with him and with others to get us to a compromise on levels of funding that are realistic and well conceived by Mr. ROGERS, by Mr. COCHRAN, and by others.

Until we do that, we are going to be in a place where we are going to be, I predict, in late September, on the threshold of giving some fear that the government is going to shut down again, the greatest government on the face of the Earth. I am not sure what people around the world thought when we shut our government down for 16 days. It was not a confidence builder. That is for sure.

We have another item that we are losing confidence on, the highway bill. You didn't mention, Mr. Leader, anything about the highway bill being scheduled. I understand it does not ex-

pire until July 31, so we have about 6 weeks, maybe a little longer than that.

Does the gentleman know whether there is any compromise being achieved so that we can give confidence to States, counties, municipalities, contractors, the business community that they will have a funding stream to invest in building, repairing, and maintaining our infrastructure in this country?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will answer your question, but, first, I just want to make sure I clarify as to your earlier question.

I am just reading here from Politico, as you have been able to read other statements. It says here that the Senate Democrats are prepared to shut down the government. Leader REID outlined Senate Democrats' obstructionist plan for the summer.

They have a title and a time for it, obstructionists for the summer, warning that, because of the Democrats' plan to block appropriations bills, we are heading for another shutdown.

Unfortunately, as I read in other articles of this same time period, I believe the incoming leader on the other side, too—Senator SCHUMER—said he was actually working with the administration on this. I do not think this is helpful.

For the history of why we are where we are, sequester was an idea from this administration. The President is the one who put that into the bill. We are writing appropriation bills to the law. That is what our rules are and what we are doing. We are getting our work done, and we are hopeful that this Democratic plan of obstructionists throughout the summer will not come true.

Now, you asked about the highway bill. This is a very good question and is one that I do want to work with you on because we were working together on this, Republicans and Democrats, from our committee.

Unfortunately, as the gentleman may know, a month or so ago, your side of the aisle said they had to stop working with us. Part of the reason we were given was that it fell into the obstructionist plan for the summer, that it wasn't just about appropriations, but that you wanted to somehow shut down transportation, which we do not want to do.

We want to get to a 5-year plan, and we were working with you on offsets to be able to pay for this throughout the rest of the year. Unfortunately, when the Democrats decided to stop this program, we had to just go to July.

We know we have some time left, and we are very committed to getting this done. We think it is important for America to keep them working, and we hope you will come back to the table and work with us because we will be more than willing to work with you.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I think that is my

reputation, that of wanting to work to constructively achieve joint objectives—in this case, the highway bill.

Mr. RYAN is on the floor, but I won't ask him to yield for a question as to whether or not the Ways and Means Committee has come up with a way to finance the highway bill.

I know he said that there is not going to be a gasoline tax, which, historically, Republican Presidents have been for. I am not suggesting this be it, but maybe tax reform, as my friend has said publicly for that.

I will repeat, Mr. Leader, there is no Democrat who wants to shut down the government. I hear what you said. I know the quote. What they have said is they are not going to shut it down indirectly as you want to do. Now, you have done it directly.

I do not mean you, personally, but the only two times that I have served in the Congress of the United States over the last 34 years when the government was shut down as a policy was in 1995 under Newt Gingrich and in the last Congress. Those were the only times, and I have been here 34 years.

Has it happened inadvertently for a couple of days? Yes, it has, because the legislation was not agreed to or we couldn't get it to the President in time or things of that nature.

Let me say something because, on your side of the aisle, you love to say this. You love to place sequestration at the feet of President Obama's. Now, my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has not been here as long as I have, but sequestration originally started certainly in Gramm-Rudman—or it may have even started before then—with Phil Gramm, a Republican from Texas, and Mr. Rudman, a Republican from New Hampshire. That is when it started. Then we see all the time the across-the-board cuts—the 1 percent, the 2 percent, the 3 percent. Now, we have defeated them, but that is a part of sequestration.

More importantly, on 7/15/11, your side, in charge of the Congress, offered a bill that you called Cut, Cap, and Balance. Now, this was 5 days or 6 days before your allegation that Mr. Lew went to the majority leader then, Mr. REID, and said maybe sequestration will help get this bill through.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we were confronting the failure to reauthorize the payment of America's bills, the debt limit. That was what we were facing. What Mr. Lew was suggesting was that the Republicans liked sequestration, so maybe if we put that in the bill, even though we don't like it, they will vote for not defaulting on the national debt.

In fact, that is what happened; but if you look at your Cut, Cap, and Balance bill—your bill I voted against—the fallback that you suggested was sequestration. That was about a week before Mr. Lew said to Mr. REID that maybe that will get our Republican friends to support paying the national debt.

That passed, by the way, on the July 19, 2011. It was 6 days later that Mr.

Lew, in trying to get something done to make sure that America did not default, suggested to Mr. REID maybe putting that in the bill will get the Republicans' votes so that we will pay our debts.

The problem is, if you know the facts, you get a little frustrated with hearing this representation, the President was for sequester. Let's just, for the sake of argument, say that nobody here was for sequester. Then let's get rid of sequester. If you are for sequester, I get it. You don't want to change it.

There are a lot of your Members who certainly don't want to change it. I tell people all over this country when I talk to them that sequester is a complicated word. It starts with an S. It stands for "stupid." It is a policy unrelated to opportunities, to challenges, and to needs. It was a number pulled out of the air.

I would hope, Mr. Leader, that we don't talk about "you did it" and "you did it." Let's talk about how we solve the problems confronting our country. Ex-Im is one of them. Appropriations bills that we can agree on is another and highway bill funding to give confidence to our economy and to our entities that have to keep people moving and commerce moving.

Let's give them confidence. Let's sit down. Let's get these done. Let's bring it to the floor. As Speaker BOEHNER said, let this House work its will.

The gentleman referred to the 46 Democrats who voted with him and his party on the most recent bill, which was a tax reduction and which is, as are all of the tax reductions that you have brought to the floor, unpaid for.

Very frankly, as the father of three daughters, as the grandfather of three grandchildren, and as the great-grandfather of three great-grandchildren, I don't like the fact that the expectation is they will pay the bill. They don't vote, of course, so they can't vote for or against us.

My daughters can, notwithstanding the 46 people who voted for it on our side of the aisle because they are for the policy. I will tell you I have talked to a lot of them, and they are not for not paying for it, but they were put in the position of either being for something, therefore, or being against something because it is not paid for and is hurting future generations.

The only reason I mention that is the gentleman brought it up, and I will tell him that there is very broad, almost unanimous sentiment on our side that we ought to pay for things, and when that policy was in place, we balanced the budget for 4 years in a row.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Hopefully, I can take from the gentleman's comments that he is willing to work with us on highways and on coming back to the table. I appreciate that.

We may disagree on whether the administration put it in the bill in se-

quester, but I think history will prove me right. I look forward to it just as we worked throughout this week and passed two bills today on a bipartisan level.

You may have disagreed with one, but 28 on your side of the aisle agreed with it, so did your President. We look forward to getting this work done for the American people. We work within the current law. That is what we look to do, and I look forward to continuing to work with you.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that in that spirit, there are 240 people in this House who think the Ex-Im Bank ought to be extended and reauthorized. I hope we will follow that process. I would reiterate, yes, I am willing to work with the gentleman on highways or on anything else which will benefit the American people and our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

—  
 HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 19, 2015, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 319, I call up the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-157 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1190

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act

(Public Law 111-148), sections 3403 and 10320 of such Act (including the amendments made by such sections) are repealed, and any provision of law amended by such sections is hereby restored as if such sections had not been enacted into law.

#### SEC. 3. RESCINDING FUNDING AMOUNTS FOR PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

Section 4002(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-11(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "2017" and inserting "2016";

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking "2022" and inserting "2026"; and

(B) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (7); and

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

"(3) for fiscal year 2017, \$390,000,000;

"(4) for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, \$487,000,000;

"(5) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, \$585,000,000;

"(6) for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, \$780,000,000; and"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we are bringing to the floor today is Dr. ROE's bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This is a bill that came out of the Committee on Ways and Means with a bipartisan vote. This is an agency that Members on both sides of the aisle believe does not have the right to exist, should not exist, and does not follow our democratic process.

Let me explain why we are doing this. There is no greater example of the conflict of visions than this. ObamaCare created something called IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board. It is a board of 15 people who are not elected or appointed.

They have the power to cut Medicare's payments for treatment. They have a quota which they have to hit in order to find the same number to actually cut. Every year, a formula kicks in, and the 15 unelected bureaucrats

find where they are going to cut Medicare payments to providers to hit that quota.

They can do all of this without Congress' approval. The idea, of course, is that unelected bureaucrats know best, unelected bureaucrats know better than patients, their doctors, or their representatives in Congress; they will know which treatment works the best because they are detached, they are distant, they are above the fray, they are not involved in the emotions or the personal relationships that such personal decisions like your health care ultimately involve.

That is the big problem. They are totally unaccountable. They are divorced from reality. Health care is not a statistic. It is not a formula. It is not uniform. It is not cookie cutter. It is personal. It is individual. It is distinct.

Every patient is different. This is why patients, along with their doctors, need to be put in charge of their health care. What IPAB would essentially do is ration health care. It would take control away from patients.

Now, the other side says, Hey, no, not so fast; Congress can override them—but that is only with a supermajority vote.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this movie before. It never ends well. Seniors will suffer the consequences. Medicare is more than a program; Medicare is a promise. Seniors have worked hard; they have paid their taxes; they have planned on Medicare throughout all their working lives, and now that they are retired, it is something that they deserve, a secure retirement. It needs to be there, just like it has been for our parents.

Think about what a Member of Congress will do. This Board of unelected bureaucrats will say, We are cutting Medicare X, Y, and Z ways to these providers for Medicare, which will deny services to seniors; and they will do it according to this formula that is in law.

If Congress doesn't like it, then the law says Congress has to go cut Medicare somewhere else and overturn this ruling with a three-fifths supermajority vote in the House and the Senate—as if that would ever happen.

All this thing has done, it is designed to basically go around Congress, go around the laws, and have unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats ration care for our seniors.

This is wrong; it is undemocratic; it does not fit with our Constitution, and we think it ought to be repealed. That is why we are bringing this bill to the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, June 12, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I write in regard to H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means

on June 2, 2015. As you are aware, the bill also was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 1190 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 1190 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1190 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, DC, June 9, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of H.R. 1190. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,  
Chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The real purpose of this bill at this time, indeed, is to take a further effort to repeal ACA. That is really what this is about at this particular moment. The Republican leadership is, yet again, taking aim at ACA. H.R. 1190 would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB. This would really be the 59th vote to repeal or undermine ACA.

Since it passed, we have seen the slowest growth in healthcare prices over any period of that length in nearly 50 years. Growth in per enrollee healthcare spending across both the public and private sectors has been controlled.

The three slowest years of growth in real per capita national health expenditures on record were 2011, 2012, and 2013. The ACA, in essence, has changed the healthcare cost landscape, keeping cost increases down and keeping or helping, at least, to keep families out of debt.

While we know the Medicare delivery system reforms have been working to

deliver value and lower costs, the IPAB was created as a backstop—a backstop—only to come into effect if other efforts weren't successful. This should be clear. IPAB only comes into being if delivery system reforms aren't doing their job to manage Medicare.

According to the CBO, Medicare growth rates are projected to remain beneath IPAB targets throughout the entire budget window, thereby not triggering the Board's provisions until 2024. I think, when you subtract 2015 from 2024, you get 9 years; so here we are, on this date, at this time, 9 years, according to CBO, before the provisions would come into effect, asking this Congress to repeal the IPAB provision.

If the ACA's delivery system efforts continue to be successful, IPAB may never even need to be constituted. It is specifically prohibited from cutting benefits or raising costs on seniors.

What IPAB can do, however, is to make recommendations to go after overpayments, go after fraud and abuse, and try to improve, if needed, the way there is reform of the delivery system. IPAB will not take away Medicare benefits; it will not shift costs to seniors.

If we in Congress are doing our job as stewards of Medicare, we can manage cost growth while protecting beneficiaries on the front end. In the event IPAB makes recommendations, Congress always has the ability to disapprove or modify them. If we do our job, we won't need IPAB. If we fail to do our job, IPAB will prod us to action 9 years from now or perhaps even later.

Let me talk a few words about the offset. It is a significant reduction of funding for the prevention and public health fund. While the Republicans so far have come forth with their proposals that are never paid for, this time, they have decided to have a pay-for, but it would cut by half or more than that the current funding for the prevention and public health fund.

That fund was established in the ACA to provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health and will provide \$900 million this year alone for interventions that will reduce smoking, tackle heart disease, and help improve prenatal outcomes.

I have a listing of what it has meant for Michigan, just as one example: \$3.5 million for State health department efforts to prevent obesity and diabetes; \$3.8 million to address chronic disease risk factors among African Americans, American Indians, Latinos, and other minorities; \$3.3 million for community transformation grants in central Michigan to address heart disease prevention and diabetes; and almost \$3 million for tobacco use prevention.

Here we are, at long last, the Republicans come forth with a pay-for, and they are paying for it by taking away something that really, really matters.

We have in front of us a Statement of Administration Policy, and I ask that it be placed in the RECORD. It just repeats some of the points that I have



made, so I will leave it just to be entered into the Record; and, therefore, I will now say that we should not vote for this legislation.

It would repeal a part of ACA designed to help keep healthcare costs under control, and so importantly, it would cut critical public health and prevention funding.

I reserve the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
H.R. 1190—PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO  
MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

(Rep. Roe, R-TN, June 15, 2015)

The Affordable Care Act has improved the American health care system, on which Americans can rely throughout life. After more than five years under this law, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage. Up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access to coverage. And, health care prices have risen at the slowest rate in nearly 50 years. As we work to make the system even better, we are open to ideas that improve the accessibility, affordability, and quality of health care, and help middle-class Americans.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) will be comprised of fifteen expert members, including doctors and patient advocates, and will recommend to the Congress policies that reduce the rate of Medicare growth and help Medicare provide better care at lower costs. IPAB has been highlighted by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) economists, and health policy experts as contributing to Medicare's long-term sustainability. The Board is prohibited from recommending changes to Medicare that ration health care, restrict benefits, modify eligibility, increase cost sharing, or raise premiums or revenues. Under current law, the Congress retains the authority to modify, reject, or enhance IPAB recommendations to strengthen Medicare, and IPAB recommendations would take effect only if the Congress does not act to slow Medicare cost growth.

H.R. 1190 would repeal and dismantle the IPAB even before it has a chance to work. The bill would eliminate an important safeguard that, under current law, will help reduce the rate of Medicare cost growth responsibly while protecting Medicare beneficiaries and the traditional program. While this safeguard is not projected to be needed now or for a number of years given recent exceptionally slow growth in health care costs, it could serve a valuable role should rapid growth in health costs return.

CBO estimates that repealing the IPAB would increase Medicare costs and the deficit by \$7 billion over 10 years. The Administration would strongly oppose any effort to offset this increased Federal budget cost by reducing the Prevention and Public Health Fund. The Affordable Care Act created this Fund to help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. There has been bipartisan and bicameral support for allocation of the Fund, and the Congress directed uses of the Fund through FY 2014 and FY 2015 appropriations legislation. The Fund supports critical investments such as tobacco use reduction and programs to reduce health-care associated infections. By concentrating on the causes of chronic disease, the Fund helps more Americans stay healthy.

The Administration is committed to strengthening Medicare for those who depend on it and protection of the public's health. We believe that this legislation fails to accomplish these goals. If the President were

presented with H.R. 1190, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the author of the legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud sponsor of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act. This bipartisan legislation, which I introduced with my colleague, LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB.

Created by the Affordable Care Act, this panel of 15 unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats exists to cut Medicare spending to meet arbitrary budgets and have been given enormous powers to do so.

Listen to this carefully. Peter Orszag, President Obama's former budget director, has noted IPAB represents the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve. Let me repeat that: the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, we just spent, in a bipartisan way, 3 years working through SGR reform. Seventeen times, we kicked the can down the road so our seniors wouldn't be denied access to care. This bill is basically SGR on steroids. It trumps all the work we just did on SGR reform.

Any proposal made by IPAB will be considered using expedited procedures, and without a three-fifths vote in the Senate, Congress can only modify the type of cuts proposed, not the amount, so we have to do the amount. If Congress doesn't act on IPAB's recommendation, the cuts will automatically go into effect. To make matters worse, the Board is exempt from administrative or judicial review.

On the projections between 2020 and 2024, the CBO can't tell me from year to year, within the tens of billions of dollars, what the budget deficit is going to be each year, so I don't put a lot of stock in that.

If the President does not nominate individuals to serve on the IPAB or if the IPAB fails to recommend cuts when required to do so, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the power to make the changes unilaterally.

□ 1315

One person will make those changes for the entire country. Think about that for a second. One person would have the ability to reshape a program that has 55 million enrollees. Whatever you may think about the President's healthcare law, this just isn't right.

After practicing medicine for more than 30 years, I can tell you that no two patients are the same and that different approaches are required for different needs. IPAB is blind to that fact and will ration seniors' access to care through a one-size-fits-all payment policy.

Medicare desperately needs reform to ensure it continues to be there for current beneficiaries and the next generation, but this is not the way. We can do better.

It is time to go back to the drawing board. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and put medical decisions back where they belong. Mr. Speaker, that is between patients and doctors.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This legislation is a ghost hunt. It doesn't exist. There is no IPAB. There is nobody that has been appointed. Nothing is going to happen until 2024.

So the question you have to ask yourself is: Why are we out here? Well, we are out here because some people think that trying to control costs in health care is a bad idea.

If you go back and read the Medicare legislation when it was put in, the AMA extracted from this Congress the right to charge their usual and customary fees. They have been driving the costs, and we have been trying to control it with all kinds of mechanisms all the way through it. Only with the incidence of the ACA have we seen the curve come down.

We have actually extended the life of Medicare to 2030. Right now, we are spending 17 percent of our gross domestic product on health care. When I came to this Congress, it was about 12 or 13 percent. It has only gone up. We have not been able to do it ourselves. So the creators of this bill said: Let's put something in on the outside that can give us some suggestions.

Now, when we had Simpson-Bowles—and I know the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee thought the Simpson-Bowles idea was a good idea—what happened after it was brought out in public? Nothing. We ignored it.

The reason for IPAB is to put pressure on the Congress to act to control costs. I guess Republicans don't care about costs because they don't understand that there are 10,000 people signing up for Social Security every single day. That is 3.5 million people.

The numbers are going up. The costs are going to go up. People are going to run around here saying we have got to cut benefits; we have got to shift the costs to the old people; we have got to do all this. The IPAB was a way to force the Congress to face the consequences of their own inaction.

Dr. ROE is correct; we spent 16 years kicking the can down the road on this issue of SGR. That was, again, an attempt to control costs. It never worked. It was ill-conceived in the beginning.

This is an issue where there is some real muscle in it, and people are afraid of that. They are afraid of it 9 years



out because they know how the Congress does. This is just another way to try to undercut and make Medicare and the ACA not work.

Mr. LEVIN pointed out the other thing that is important, and that is the place they look for the money is to go to community health, health departments. Nobody needs health departments. Why do you need people looking at restaurants to see if they are safe to go into, or to look at the water supply or look at what is happening in sewage? You don't need that stuff.

This \$7 billion they are going to grab here is straight out of the health departments of our country. Every one of your counties is going to be facing the impact of this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. McDERMOTT. The only thing that I think one can say is that it is a bad idea to get rid of some muscle to force us to look at costs, but it is worse to pay for it by taking money away from health departments. They are the ones that always get cut.

Who wants inspectors? The other side says: We don't like regulations. It is regulations that are ruining America. We have got to get those regulations out.

You don't want regulations enforced in restaurants? Then take \$7 billion away from it and see what kind of restaurant problems you start to have.

Milwaukee had the cryptosporidium organism in the water supply. That is a health problem that is dealt with by the actual health department in the county. We are taking \$7 billion to pay for this badly constructed idea.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have spent going on four decades taking care of patients in rural east Tennessee, and I saw access becoming more and more and more of a problem. It is a serious issue now, as Medicare costs have gone up and up and up.

I have a mother who is almost 93. She has a difficult time affording her health care and other needs that she has. One of the things I am very concerned with, as Dr. McDERMOTT said, we have 10,000 seniors a day getting on that program. We need to leave those decisions to doctors and patients, not to bureaucrats.

Let me give a little more information. There is a similar panel in England called NICE, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, I believe is what the acronym is. The other day, the Royal College of Surgeons talked about how they noticed that over 75, almost nobody got operated on for breast cancer, almost nobody over 75 got a gall bladder operation, almost nobody over 75 got a knee fixed, and almost nobody over 75 got a hip fixed. That is wrong, and that is exactly the pathway we are going down if we don't stop this nonsense.

There is a very good article in the New England Journal of Medicine published in 2011. I recommend you all read it. It is a look back from 25 years. That is the only information they had. This particular author was not for IPAB or against it; he just analyzed it.

Twenty-one of those 25 years, IPAB would have kicked in, meaning those cuts would have happened. And I can tell you this right now: our seniors better look at this with a laser beam on because their care is going to be cut if this goes into effect. We need to get rid of it now, before that happens.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California), a very active member of our committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

I am the Democratic lead, along with Congressman PHIL ROE, and I am proud of the bipartisan work we have done to repeal the unelected bureaucracy known as the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB. I proudly voted for the ACA, and I think time has shown that the law works. The ACA has reduced the number of uninsured Americans, lowered healthcare costs, prevented disease, and increased access to cures.

Despite the success of the law, no bill is perfect. I believe that there are certain areas for improvement in the ACA, and I am committed to working in a bipartisan manner to solve these issues and provide our constituents with the world-class health care that they deserve.

The ACA is a good law and a few small tweaks can make it stronger, and that is why I decided to reach across the aisle to work with Congressman ROE on this legislation. Repealing IPAB is not the exclusive purview of the Republican Party, and it is a bipartisan effort.

Unfortunately, much like the last time Congress considered IPAB repeal in 2012, an unpalatable pay-for undermined the bipartisan support for a deal. I know Congressman ROE has worked tirelessly to avoid repeating the pay-for battle that we had back in 2012 in order to retain Democratic support.

Despite these efforts, Republican leadership has chosen to draw from the prevention and public health fund to pay for H.R. 1190. This is something that I simply cannot support, and it is with great disappointment that I must cast my vote against H.R. 1190. I truly believe that repealing IPAB is the right thing to do, but I cannot support gutting a great provision in the ACA to get rid of a bad one.

The prevention and public health fund is an unprecedented investment in public health to prevent costly and life-threatening diseases. The fund has invested nearly \$5.25 billion in States, cities, and communities to keep our

constituents healthy and safe before they need costly, long-term care to manage their illnesses.

The fund also exists to prevent stroke, cancer, tobacco use, and obesity, while also funding vital childhood immunization programs, and invests in detecting, tracking, and responding to infectious diseases. County public health departments rely on this fund to serve their constituents, and I know my home State of California has received over \$195 million thus far.

Despite all this, the Republican leadership has decided to take approximately \$8.85 billion from the fund which actually helps lower the cost of health care through prevention, eliminating the need, ironically, for IPAB in the first place.

In closing, I again want to thank Congressman ROE and the 235 bipartisan cosponsors for their hard work. I am disappointed that I must vote against my own bill, because I know the underlying policy is good policy, but I cannot vote for something that drains an essential fund from the ACA.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time allotment remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, let me take a couple of minutes to explain why Americans fear the Independent Payment Advisory Board, as it meddles with their health care.

As I stand here today, I will tell you that I am a physician, and I can tell you what is already taking place within private insurance with these peer reviews when you recommend something.

I recommended an MRI to a patient. That afternoon, I get on the phone. The woman says: I have had a problem for 10 years. I have had cortisone injections, physical therapy, blah, blah, blah.

I said: You need an MRI.

I am being denied the MRI by the insurance company because I have only seen her once. And I said to the gentleman, the doctor on the phone: How many times have you seen her?

None.

I said: What State do you have a license to practice in?

Not Ohio, which is where we were.

And so I said: Tell me your specialty.

My specialty is foot and ankle. This woman was in for a foot problem.

He said: I am an emergency room doctor.

I said: Well, then you would refer her to a specialist, which is where she is today.

He said: Well, I am not going to let you get that MRI.

I said: I hope this call is monitored for quality assurance, because I want someone to hear what you said to me today.

And then I asked the patient if she would go to her HR director and call the insurance company and say: We are going to drop the insurance because you are not letting the patients get the care their doctor recommends.

And then we got it. Within 3 weeks, I had her better because I knew what was wrong once I had the MRI.

Imagine trying to have that type of a discussion with the Independent Payment Advisory Board. If they pick up their phone, will they have a conversation with you about the patient?

This is a problem. This is what Americans are fearing today. And this is why the Independent Payment Advisory Board should go away.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. It is a great bill. We should pass it. IPAB is a bad agency. It should not have been created in the first place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB, one of the most ominous provisions in the sweeping overhaul of health care known as the Affordable Care Act.

The stated purpose of IPAB is to reduce Medicare's per capita growth rate. The Board is to be made up of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats—by the way, you can't have a majority of docs on the Board—who will be paid \$165,300 a year to serve 6-year terms on the Board.

This panel of 15 unelected and unaccountable government bureaucrats is tasked with reducing Medicare costs through arbitrary cuts to providers, limiting access to care for seniors. If Medicare growth goes over an arbitrary target, the Board is required to submit a proposal to Congress that would reduce Medicare's growth rate.

These recommendations will automatically go into effect, unless Congress passes legislation that would achieve the same amount of savings. In order to do so, Congress must meet an almost impossible deadline and clear an almost insurmountable legislative hurdle.

The Board has the power to make binding decisions about Medicare policy, with no requirement for public comment prior to issuing its recommendations, and individuals and providers will have no recourse against the Board because its decisions cannot be appealed or reviewed. In other words, the Board will make major healthcare legislation essentially outside the usual legislative process.

The Board is also limited in how it can achieve the required savings. Therefore, IPAB's recommendations will be restricted to cutting provider

reimbursements. In many cases, Medicare already reimburses below the costs of providing services; and we are already seeing doctors refusing to take new Medicare patients—or Medicare patients at all—because they cannot afford to absorb the losses.

Any additional provider cuts will lead to fewer Medicare providers, and that means that beneficiary access will suffer. Seniors will be forced to wait in longer and longer lines to be seen by an ever-shrinking pool of providers or have to travel longer and longer distances to find a provider willing to see them.

Clearly, Medicare growth is on an out-of-control trajectory that endangers the solvency and continued existence of the program. IPAB, however, is not the solution.

Mr. Speaker, the House voted 223–181 in 2012 to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Today, H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, enjoys the support of 235 of our House colleagues who have signed on as cosponsors.

The time has come for the House to once again repeal this flawed policy, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1190.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1190. This bill would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, and pay for it by drastically reducing our investment in prevention and public health.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support IPAB. I oppose independent commissions playing a legislative role other than on the recommendatory basis. It is not the job of an independent commission to make decisions on healthcare policy for Medicare beneficiaries. Congress simply must stop ceding legislative power to outside bodies.

However, IPAB remains an insignificant provision from the Affordable Care Act, as it has not even been convened. Because of how well other provisions of the ACA are working, Medicare cost growth rates are projected to remain beneath IPAB targets through the entire budget window, thereby not triggering the IPAB provisions until 2024 at the earliest.

That said, I urge this House to oppose H.R. 1190, which would pay for IPAB repeal by effectively gutting the Affordable Care Act's prevention and public health fund, an incredibly significant provision from the ACA.

The prevention and public health fund is a mechanism to provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health, to improve health outcomes, and to enhance healthcare quality. The fund has worked to reduce tobacco use, promote community prevention and use of preventive services, and combat healthcare associated infections.

This year the fund will invest nearly \$1 billion in programs that will benefit

every State, and these dollars go to proven, effective ways to keep Americans healthier and more productive.

In my home State of New Jersey, we have received more than \$47.5 million for prevention and public health fund programs. This bill would walk back these and other important strides we have made in public health and prevention.

This bill is yet another Republican attempt to attack and undermine the Affordable Care Act. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) manage the remainder of the Committee on Energy and Commerce time on the Democratic side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valued member of our Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

The President's healthcare law included the creation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB. Despite its name, IPAB is the opposite of independent, Mr. Speaker. IPAB is a group of 15 unelected members, unaccountable to the American people. IPAB's job is to control Medicare spending. That sounds nice, but they only have one way to do that, by cutting reimbursement rates for doctors and hospitals.

Seniors rely on Medicare, as well as the doctors who will see them. If this unelected, unaccountable Board cuts reimbursement rates, doctors will stop seeing Medicare patients. That is bad for the 180,000 seniors in my district.

Support this bill, and let's abolish IPAB. I look forward to a bipartisan vote in support of H.R. 1190.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation, H.R. 1190, for reasons that I will detail in a moment.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman indicated there were 235 people for this bill in this House. I just observed a few minutes ago there are 240 people for Export-Import Bank. We have brought this bill to the floor. I would hope the gentleman would urge his side, when 60 of his folks are for it, all of ours are for it, to bring the Export-Import Bank to the floor because it is about jobs.

Having said that—and I want to acknowledge that I am a good friend and

have great respect for the sponsor of this bill, Dr. ROE. He and I have worked together on anaphylactic shock and the dangers caused by the eating of peanuts. He is a good doctor. He is a good person.

We happen to disagree on this bill, however. This, essentially, will be the 60th vote, over the next 2 days, 4 days, on the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

We obviously have a difference of opinion on the Affordable Care Act. I believe it is working. I believe that millions of people are covered by insurance. Because of the Affordable Care Act, millions of children are covered under their parents' policy, and millions of seniors are paying less for prescription drugs. Millions of people with a preexisting condition have the confidence that they can get insurance.

The bill we are debating today and voting on next week would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, as it is referred to.

Now, I was disappointed at the reference of "bureaucrats." It is used as an epithet, unfortunately, not as a descriptive term.

The fact of the matter is these folks are appointed and they make recommendations. They make recommendations to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress of the United States can reject them; and/or the President of the United States, if the Congress passes legislation to set that aside, can consider it as well.

IPAB develops proposals to contain the rate of growth of Medicare spending. The Board hasn't been formed. There are no members appointed yet; yet Republicans are asking taxpayers to spend \$7-plus billion over the next 10 years to eliminate it. It is not that it has acted badly. It is not that they are irresponsible. There are no people appointed to this Board yet.

The Affordable Care Act has slowed the growth of healthcare costs to its lowest rate in 50 years. That helps every American, whether they are covered by the Affordable Care Act or private employer insurance or self-insured.

As a result, CBO predicts that action by the Board would not even be triggered until 2024, but the cuts to the prevention fund would act now. Republicans are paying for this bill by cutting funding for disease prevention and public health now. Even then, CBO reports that this bill still bends the healthcare cost curve in the wrong direction over the long run.

Today, as has been observed, we passed another bill. That one was without offsets. That will create an additional \$24 billion deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the House has a choice. It can continue the same old partisan attacks against affordable health care and add billions to the deficit, undermine prevention and public health, bringing deficit-financed tax cuts passed by this Republican-led Congress up to \$610.7 billion since January.

Somebody is going to pay that bill because we are not. My generation is not being asked to pay for it, \$610.7 billion.

It could reject, of course, the politics as usual and, instead, work together in a bipartisan way to focus on creating jobs, lowering the deficit, and investing in a competitive economy.

You heard the sponsor of this bill saying, I cannot support it, the gentlewoman from California, because the proponents of this bill would rather attack the Affordable Care Act than they would to pass this bill.

Now, they want to pass this bill, but their priority is undermining the Affordable Care Act, which is why they didn't work with Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ and others who agree with them on the policy. I have to disagree with them on the policy; but they have even put people who agree with them in a place where they cannot support the undermining of the Affordable Care Act and preventive health in America.

Let's choose to work together to do what American people are asking us to do, not undermine the critical healthcare reforms that are containing costs, increasing access, and improving quality.

That is why I opposed the medical device tax bill, and that is why I am urging my colleagues to defeat this one as well.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished minority whip, I do support Ex-Im Bank and urge my leaders to act on it. We are together on support of that.

Let me just mention a few things to correct the record. Number one, we had Secretary Burwell before the committee earlier this year and Dr. LARRY BUCHSON, on our Health Subcommittee, asked her specifically, when the IPAB cuts would begin to take effect. She said in 2019. In fact, the President's own budget request would begin the cuts of IPAB in 2019.

Now, you don't have to have the members of the IPAB appointed in order to have the cuts. The law, IPAB, designates the Secretary of HHS with the authority to make those cuts. To overcome those cuts, you really have to have two-thirds votes in the House and the Senate, with commensurate cuts from somewhere else in Medicare to replace those cuts that you are overcoming.

□ 1345

So this is a Board that has tremendous power that will deal with provider payments and cuts.

We just dealt with the SGR, the sustainable growth rate, in a bipartisan manner. We acted to repeal the sustainable growth rate that required cuts to provider payments for seniors, and it was supported overwhelmingly.

But if you liked the SGR, you will love IPAB. This is the SGR on steroids. It will be very difficult to overcome these 15 unelected bureaucrats, experts, whatever you want to call

them—it can't be a majority of docs, by the way—or the Secretary, whoever makes the recommendations.

We use the prevention fund as a pay-for, taking funds from the prevention fund until 2025 to reach the \$7.1 billion. But this prevention fund gets \$2 billion every year, beginning this year and every year ad infinitum. So \$2 billion in 2015, 2016, '17, '18, '19, '20, '21, '30, '31, '40, '41. Every year, the Secretary gets \$2 billion to use at her sole discretion. She doesn't have to use it for public health purposes. She has sole discretion on how this money is used.

Would you like to know some of the things she has used the money for so far?

Well, \$450 million was used for the Navigator program and implementing the Affordable Care Act; \$400,000 has been used for pickle-ball; \$235,000 for massage therapy, kick boxing, and Zumba classes, whatever that is; \$7.5 million on promoting free pet neutering; \$3 million for the New York Department of Health to lobby for the passage of a soda tax; money for gardening projects, fast food, small businesses, bike clubs.

Rather than spend money on questionable projects, lobbying campaigns for higher taxes, and for Affordable Care Act media campaigns, H.R. 1190 would rather use these funds to protect Medicare seniors and their health care because the money for the operation of IPAB, for these salaries, for their travel, for all their expenses comes directly out of the trust fund moneys for seniors, used for seniors and those with disabilities. That is wrong.

We are constraining. We are not repealing the prevention fund to pay for this, but we need to constrain the use of that fund. And good public health policy ought to come before the Congress, not be at the sole discretion of this one Secretary or czar or however you might want to term it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in favor of this legislation, H.R. 1190, and I urge the Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I oppose H.R. 1190.

If the Republican appetite for the repeal of the Independent Payment Advisory Board was based solely on its merits, I might be a little bit more charitable about their bringing this bill to the floor because, as you have seen from the speakers on our side, there is a legitimate debate on the merits. I have some concerns myself about the IPAB. But, unfortunately, I think that where this is coming from is this impulse, this kind of ceaseless impulse to undermine and dismantle the Affordable Care Act, and the evidence of that is in the pay-for.

Why would you want to go undermine the public health portion, really, a significant commitment that was made through the ACA to begin to turn our healthcare system towards prevention, towards public health? Frankly,

we need as many resources as we can muster to put behind that. And the pay-for for this repeal would take \$8.85 billion that has been set aside for the prevention and public health fund away from that fund and undermine all of the various activities that are being funded by it.

I don't know why it is that our colleagues on the other side cannot restrain themselves when it comes to this shiny object of repealing the ACA when we now have plenty of evidence at our fingertips as to the positive impact that the Affordable Care Act is having: 3 million young people who now can stay on the health insurance coverage of their parents, who were not covered before; millions more that are benefiting from the health exchanges across the country; seniors who now have less anxiety about falling into the so-called doughnut hole under the part D prescription drug benefit program because, under the ACA, we are beginning to close that doughnut hole; insurance companies now being barred from discriminating against people based on a preexisting condition; preventive care screening for our seniors under the Medicare program; tests and other screenings that they used to have to come out of pocket for, now that is completely covered as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

You ask the average person out there about any of those things I just mentioned, and they say: Why would we want to give these up?

These are important to our health, important to the strength of our families and our community. Yet our colleagues just don't seem to be able to help themselves when it comes to wanting to attack the Affordable Care Act.

Furthermore, if you view this IPAB as an important mechanism in terms of controlling costs, as has already been said, the trigger mechanism would not kick in for a number of years here anyway. In other words, the costs are being controlled currently. So that basis for sort of the urgency of it now in terms of bringing these other pay-fors into the mix doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

Let's acknowledge that one of the reasons that that trigger isn't going to come any time soon is because, again, the Affordable Care Act is working when it comes to controlling costs. So that is the other side of the discussion. The Affordable Care Act is working in terms of providing more coverage and improving treatment and management of chronic care on the one hand, and the evidence is that it is also reducing cost on the other hand. So it makes sense to try to preserve that, and I think the public health fund and prevention fund is a critical piece.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation for the reasons enumerated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to read into the RECORD, so that we have this information, a couple of observations from some of the groups out there that are most engaged in prevention and public health across the country and the perspective that they bring in terms of this offset, of undermining and depleting the prevention and public health fund.

The American Lung Association said, using money from the prevention fund as a pay-for would have a devastating effect on our Nation's public health.

The American Heart Association: Cardiovascular disease is a leading cause of death in the United States and is our most costly disease. The fund supports evidence-based initiatives like WISEWOMAN, a preventive health services program that provides lifestyle programs and health counseling that help low-income, uninsured, and underinsured women ages 40 to 54 prevent, delay, or control heart disease and stroke.

The American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network observes that the national breast and cervical cancer early detection program is funded in 31 States through the fund.

And there are others that have observed—the March of Dimes, the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids—that it doesn't make any sense to go raid the prevention and public health fund to support this repeal of the IPAB.

For those reasons and the others that have been presented here today, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1190.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

While the programs enumerated by the gentleman from Maryland are laudable, there is nothing in the prevention and public health fund that guarantees that these will be funded or that they are priorities. It is at the sole discretion of the Secretary as to what she would allocate the funds for. And rightly, these kinds of funds should come before Congress, and Congress should approve these kinds of public health funds.

I might mention that CBO estimates that H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, as amended, would have no budgetary effect on fiscal years 2015–16. It would reduce direct spending by \$1.8 billion over the 2016–2020 period, and reduce the direct spending by \$45 million over the 2016–25 period.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, and repealing IPAB.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act. It was critical that the Affordable Care Act (ACA) included the cutting edge delivery and payment reforms that it did. But, I have never believed that the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) will be effectively able to fulfill its stated mission of cost containment. I have concerns with how IPAB will operate and that it gives up important Congressional authority over payment.

For these reasons, I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, but once again, the House Republican majority has decided to kill the bipartisanship of this bill with a controversial pay-for. My Republican colleagues continue to prove that they would rather have an anti-ACA talking point rather than a real solution.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, my home state of New Jersey has received more than \$20 million for evidence-based programs to prevent heart attacks, strokes, cancer, obesity, and smoking from the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund. This bill, as it is being considered today, would completely gut this fund by cutting \$8.8 billion—nearly \$2 billion more than is needed to pay for repealing IPAB.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to work with Democrats to find an agreeable way to pay for this bill, and I urge opposition to this bill in its current form.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act.

While I support repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB), I oppose offsetting the cost of repeal with funds from the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the nation's single largest investment in prevention programs. Established under the Affordable Care Act, the Fund represents an unprecedented investment in preventing disease, promoting wellness, and protecting our communities against public health emergencies.

Since its creation, the Fund has invested in a broad range of evidence-based initiatives. These include community prevention programs, research, surveillance and tracking efforts, increased access to immunizations, and tobacco prevention programs.

Much of this work is done through partnerships with state and local governments, which leverage Prevention Fund dollars to best meet the local need. These monies have been used for important work, such as controlling the obesity epidemic, detecting and responding to outbreaks, and reducing health disparities.

Congress has a distinct responsibility to formulate and fund programs and initiatives that promote public health and wellness. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is one means by which Congress fulfills this obligation.

While I opposed the creation of the IPAB and support its repeal, gutting the Fund would be a significant step backwards on the path towards improving our nation's health. Rescinding \$8.85 billion to offset the costs of H.R. 1190 will have a devastating effect on our nation's health. It is not an acceptable trade off.

We spend billions of dollars on treating disease once people become sick. This investment in prevention is a key component of efforts to improve health and bend the health care cost curve. Using this money to pay for other priorities will only damage the long-term health of our nation.

I urge my colleagues to protect the federal government's only dedicated investment in prevention and vote against H.R. 1190.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, which repeals the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB), that was established under the ACA in response to high rates of growth in Medicare expenditures and charged with developing proposals to "reduce the per capita rate of growth in Medicare spending."

I oppose this bill strongly because by repealing IPAB before it has a chance to work, the bill would eliminate an important safeguard that will help reduce the rate of Medicare cost growth responsibly while protecting Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1190 is nothing but another attempt, in a long line of House Republican efforts to undermine both the Medicare guarantee and the Affordable Care Act.

Repealing IPAB cost over \$7 billion during the course of a ten year period according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

Republicans have chosen to pay for the cost of this repeal with cuts to the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund.

This fund has invested nearly \$5.25 billion into programs that support a number of public health initiatives, including obesity prevention and childhood immunization.

It has been used to increase awareness of and access to preventive health services and reduce tobacco use—concentrating on the causes of chronic disease to help more Americans stay healthy.

Eliminating these funds in the name of damaging the sustainability of Medicare is a two-pronged attack on our nation's public health.

After more than five years under the Affordable Care Act, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage; up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access to coverage.

Mr. Speaker, given the real challenges facing our nation, it is irresponsible for the Republican majority to continue bringing to the floor bills that have no chance of becoming law and would harm millions of Americans if they were to be enacted.

House Republicans have tried 58 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled more than 16 million previously uninsured Americans to know the peace of mind that comes from having access to affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Their record to date is 0–58; it will soon be 0–59 because the President has announced that he will veto this bill if it makes it to his desk.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look at the facts before prematurely repealing sections of the ACA that have significant negative impacts on Americans currently insured.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board recommends to Congress policies that reduce the rate of Medicare growth and help Medicare provide better care at lower costs.

IPAB has been highlighted by the non-partisan CBO, economists, and health policy experts as contributing to Medicare's long-term sustainability.

The Board is already prohibited from recommending changes to Medicare that ration health care, restrict benefits, modify eligibility, increase cost sharing, or raise premiums or revenues.

Under current law, the Congress retains the authority to modify, reject, or enhance IPAB recommendations to strengthen Medicare, and IPAB recommendations would take effect only if the Congress does not act to slow Medicare cost growth.

Despite the Supreme Court's upholding of the law's constitutionality, the reelection of President Obama, and Speaker JOHN BOEHNER's declaration that: "Obamacare is the law of the land," Republicans refuse to stop wast-

ing time and taxpayer money in their effort to take away the patient protections and benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we stop wasting our time in taking away healthcare protections and benefits and work to ensure that we support the current law.

A law that is providing access to an industry once denied to so many Americans and now supports millions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 1190.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### REPEAL THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, Maine is home to the most skilled woodworkers on Earth, but ObamaCare's medical device tax is killing our jobs.

Hardwood Products and Puritan companies in Guilford have been family-run businesses for nearly 100 years. 450 hard-working Mainers produce 3.5 million popsicle sticks per day. The company also manufactures more tongue depressors and medical swabs than any other business in the Western Hemisphere. Its only competitor is located in China.

Puritan Company pays nearly \$250,000 per year in medical device tax. As a result, they can't afford to buy new equipment to manufacture new medical products or hire more workers.

It is not right for this ObamaCare tax to export our manufacturing jobs to China. It is not right for this punitive tax to smother innovation that helps Americans enjoy longer and healthier lives.

Today, let's all band together, Republicans and Democrats here in the House, to deep-six this horrible tax.

□ 1400

#### COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF JUNETEENTH

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Juneteenth, the oldest celebration honoring the end of slavery in Texas and in the U.S.

In Texas, the observance of June 19 as Emancipation Day for Blacks has spread across the United States and beyond as a symbol of freedom and opportunity that reflects how far we have come as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, as Texas commemorates Juneteenth, I want to take just a little time here to acknowledge a few of the public celebrations that will take place in the congressional district that I represent.

In Grand Prairie, in the very proud Dalworth community at Tyre Park, they are going to celebrate the holiday with a fish fry and live music on Juneteenth. Also, in the city of Fort Worth, there will be a Juneteenth parade and celebration, and there will be a gathering at the Fort Worth Water Gardens in downtown Fort Worth.

I also want to acknowledge my good friend, Opal Lee, who has worked very hard to bring so much recognition of Juneteenth around the city of Fort Worth, the State, and the Nation as well.

As we mark 150 years celebrating Juneteenth, let us commemorate a new era of achievements in the Black community giving us all a chance to reflect on our roots and an opportunity to educate the next generation about such a historic day.

#### PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, which repeals ObamaCare's arbitrary Independent Payment Advisory Board, known as IPAB.

One of the most concerning and equally troubling aspects of ObamaCare is its unprecedented shift of power to Washington bureaucrats. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is no exception to that. Entrusting 15 unelected bureaucrats with across-the-board power to reduce Medicare spending and decide which treatments are determined necessary only serves to jeopardize access to quality care for our seniors.

We know by now that one-size-fits-all solutions coming from D.C. will not fix our healthcare system. Instead, we should focus on advancing well thought-out, long-term solutions to make Medicare more sustainable so we can protect access to care now and for future generations.

This bill brings us one step closer to getting Washington out of the way and putting Americans back in charge of their healthcare decisions.

## DACA ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week we marked 3 years since President Obama created the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA. He did this in response to Congress' failure to pass the DREAM Act and help children of undocumented immigrants stay here and help build a better future for America.

For children who probably know no language other than English and know no country other than America, for many of these immigrants brought here as children through no fault of their own, America is the only home they have ever known. They love this country, and they deserve a chance to stay and contribute to our Nation's future.

President Obama announced an expanded DACA last year, along with the program that deals with parents of such children to help the immigrant parents of American citizens and legal residents. Unfortunately, a partisan lawsuit has held up their implementation, and Republicans have now voted three times to end this opportunity for children of immigrants. They would split families apart.

If my Republican friends wish to change our immigration policies, they have a perfect vehicle, Mr. Speaker, for doing so: a comprehensive immigration reform bill supported, in my opinion, by a majority of the House of Representatives. Let's bring such a bill to the floor so that we can fix our broken immigration system and create a pathway to citizenship for these DREAMers and others who have been living and working here for almost all their lives.

## OUR DOCUMENTS OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, quite often, as others have already done today, when I have come before this body, it has been to recognize someone who has done something significant in my district or to speak about a bill, whether I was for it or against it, or a piece of policy or an issue. But today I don't have pre-prepared remarks. I just wanted to remind those of us who are here of why we are here. Why do we attend sessions here in this body day in and day out? What is the purpose for our being here?

Before I begin remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to personally extend my thoughts and prayers on behalf of myself and my family, as well as those of the 11th Congressional District in Georgia, to those victims of the horrific attack that happened last evening in Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Homeland Security as well as the special task force on foreign fighters, and as part of that, we spend a lot of time studying terrorism and the terrorist attacks against this Nation. One thing that I have seen that is consistent about these terrorist attacks is that they are attacking us not because of who we are. Most of them don't even know our names. They may not know our families or what we believe, and it may well be the case in Charleston, as I know it was in Garland, Texas, in the attacks there, they didn't even know their victims. But what I have seen with these attacks of terrorism is they are attacks about what we stand for, and that is freedom.

In Garland, Texas, it was an attack on the First Amendment, our freedom of speech. Last night, it was an attack on the most fundamental right that our Founding Fathers gave to us, and that is our freedom of religion, a right that, as they said, was given to us by God and cannot be taken away.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity since being in Congress a short amount of time—and it is more than an opportunity, it is really a privilege—to take constituents as they come to the Capitol here on tours. As I walk down the Halls of this building and I point out the statue of Thomas Jefferson that we have right outside the Chamber, or even as I stand here, the image of Moses is looking at me as he is looking over the Chamber, as I see the statues of our Founding Fathers, they have left us reminders of why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, as we are getting close to the great anniversary festival of the birth of this Nation, I think it is imperative and important that we as a body are reminded of why we are here. I just want to speak briefly about two phrases that you can find in Washington, D.C., that remind us not only of why we are here, but what it takes to preserve the freedom that we have been given.

Mr. Speaker, as I walked down the aisle to come to this podium, I just glanced up above the rostrum where you are standing, and I see four words, "In God We Trust." That is one of the phrases that my eyes often go to as I am sitting in this Chamber as we are debating bills. I reflect back on why do we have that phrase here?

Well, it also goes back to another phrase that I have seen recently as I was taking a tour of The Mall outside this building, where we have the museums of the heritage of this Nation. There is also a building there, the National Archives. Inside that building are the documents of freedom, the most hallowed of all of our documents: the Constitution; the Bill of Rights; and then the one that we hold the most sacred, the one that is most requested by visitors to this Nation's Capital to see, and that is the Declaration of Independence.

In that Declaration, our Founding Fathers expressed what they believed

that this Nation would be one day. It was their vision, it was their faith, and it was their philosophy about this new Nation. They were revolutionary ideas that they brought forth because it was the first time in the history of mankind that a government existed with emphasis on the freedom of individual, empowering the individual. Every other government on the face of the Earth before this had focused its attention upon a group, a collective, whether it was by their race or their religion or aristocracy or their family line. But our Founding Fathers sensed something different: if we empower the individual, if we recognize the rights that God has given them and we give them the freedom to excel and exceed, then our Nation, as a whole, would excel.

They believed that these rights were important to be protected: the right to speak freely, the right to have ideas, the right to pursue happiness, the right to pursue commerce, and the right to worship without fear of oppression from the government. These were revolutionary ideas.

They also knew that they had a challenge. Because of these revolutionary ideas, they knew that they would not be well accepted by other governments because it threatened the power base of those governments. In fact, they knew they would have to take on the most powerful military force in the history of the entire world if they were ever going to see these ideas come to fruition.

Now, think about that. This ragtag rabble of Washington's soldiers would have to take on the most powerful military force in the history of the world. It was an impossible task, and they understood that. But, Mr. Speaker, that phrase that is in marble above the rostrum reflects one of those two key phrases, because in the last line of the Declaration of Independence, our Founding Fathers wrote these words: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."

You see, "In God We Trust" was the first element that they identified that we must have if we were going to preserve this freedom that they were fighting for.

Now, outside the National Archives, where that Declaration is still on display, are the words, "Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom."

"Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom."

You see, that is the second phrase that I think we must be reminded of today. The second part of that last line of the Declaration of Independence says, "we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor." You see, freedom is not free, and it is held and it is protected at a price.

Just recently, I was given the opportunity to travel to the beaches of Normandy. As I stood upon the sands of



Omaha Beach, I started reflecting upon the price that was paid that day for our freedom and our liberty. I brought back a little bit of the sand from the beach, as my dad was in World War II and served in that theater. And as I sat at home right around Memorial Day, I was looking at that jar of sand, and I started thinking: What if these sands could speak? What would they say? What would they tell us in this august body here? What would they tell the people of our Nation if that sand could speak?

You see, that sand absorbed the blood of American patriots who had the courage to step off of those Higgins boats into the line of fire, and I wondered why would they do that, knowing that more than likely they would never return back home. You see, that sand absorbed the blood of these patriots.

The sand also may be able to tell us of the last words that were spoken by some of those patriots as they drew their last breath after giving their lives, their very lives, for our freedom. Would they tell the name of the father or mother as they cried out their last cry of hope?

□ 1415

Would they tell the name of a sweetheart which they will never embrace or a brother or a sister or a child that they will never see?

As I started thinking about it, I started realizing that sand held the DNA of these soldiers—not just DNA of the soldiers, but the DNA of our entire Nation.

I believe today, Mr. Speaker, that, if that sand could tell us anything today in this body, it is to remember what they died for.

I believe, if that sand could speak today, that sand would tell us these words: this is why we died, because we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to ensure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

As we are nearing that celebration—we celebrate 239 years of the birth of this Nation—I call upon the Members of this body to once again reflect on why we are here, and that is to preserve freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to speak.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ISIS CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of weeks, America has asked what is our strategy to defeat

ISIS and what is the President's plan to prevent the spread of barbarism in Syria and Iraq?

For all of our advancement in self-governance, the rule of law, and a betterment of people's lives, the world stands in shock at beheadings, immolations, crucifixions, sexual enslavement, and human suffering as a way of governance could exist on earth today.

As the world has watched in horror, it has also looked to America. Where America leads, nations stand shoulder to shoulder; where America is absent, tyranny takes its chances and rears its ugly head—but who would have thought barbarity would emerge?

Since last year, the President has been unable to articulate his strategy to aid our ally in Iraq to combat ISIS. As a combat veteran of Iraq that has had to watch my American and Iraqi friends die, that has had to handle the flesh and blood of battle, that has had to do terrible things to destroy enemies, that has had to watch the good people of Iraq suffer in absence of effective government, this is deeply personal.

It is personal because I have lived among the Sunni Arab. I have celebrated his victories, his wedding, his birthdays, and his accomplishments. I have mourned as close Iraqi friends have died to acts of terror and mourned when Iraq's educated, intelligent, and free people have been expunged.

The President's refusal to negotiate a status of forces agreement and decision to abandon Iraq in 2012 is largely responsible and aided ISIS' path to destruction in that country.

We soldiers and servicemembers who have sacrificed so much in Iraq weep. We defeated Saddam's army, toppled the Ba'athist government, captured and brought a world tyrant to justice, fought an insurgency, and stood shoulder to shoulder with disenfranchised Sunnis and Kurds to restore control to Iraq's Government. We turned the country around with a military pause.

The President used that pause for abandonment and political expediency; where we sacrificed, he quit. I speak for so many of the Iraq veterans when I say: Mr. President, you have hurt us deeply. You have torn a hole within us. We are at a loss to see the state of Iraq today.

Now, as we ask what can be done, we see a strategy offered by this administration. I heard it yesterday in the House Armed Services Committee when Secretary of Defense Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Dempsey attempted to articulate it. I left more confused than when I entered.

The President is offering a plan without vision or conviction. Indeed, Secretary Carter could not even name it, calling it the so-called nine-line strategy. So-called? Do we not even have enough conviction to call the strategy some name? Is it our strategy or not? Are we so unsure of it that we do not even know what to call it? Then we were informed of the "lily pad strat-

egy." I suppose that is the one that makes us look like a bunch of toads.

The nine lines, if we decide to actually call it that, this strategy, when taken together, is mostly passive and defensive. In my 21 years of military infantry service, I have never seen enemies defeated by defense.

While passive measures are important, they are only complementary. The President is looking for nations in the Middle East to lead. Middle Eastern countries are looking to the United States for leadership. We cannot approach this problem like pushing a strand of wet spaghetti. Grab it by the front, and it will go where you want it to go.

If Iraq and Syria were a crime-ridden neighborhood, this nine-line strategy would be like relying on neighborhood watches to physically fight criminals and restore leadership of the town. The mayor and police would then tell them, Well, if you clean up your neighborhood, then we will come and provide the protection that you require—if only life worked that way.

The military can provide pauses, but we cannot provide an Iraqi collapse when the President pulls out all the protection necessary to sustain a nascent government. If the United States is not committed with a diplomatic, economic, and informational solution, all the heroics exerted by our men and women in uniform to provide a window will be squandered once again if we abandon our gains.

Secretary Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Dempsey spoke of trying to find people willing to fight in Iraq. There are plenty of them. The problem is they are Sunni Arabs and Kurds. They do not wish to live under ISIS; yet we will not organize them into a Sunni-Arab and Sunni-Kurd federation that would actually stand a chance of success and would be a deadly blow to the objectives of ISIS.

They want to govern themselves because Baghdad cannot include them. They do not wish to live under ISIS' barbarity, and we should embrace them.

In the interim, what can be done that is not passive? How about some of this? Cripple Raqqa. This town, it is clear, is the center of ISIS power. The President's Cabinet says: We are worried about collateral damage and civilian casualties.

News flash, the most humane thing we can do to end the suffering of hundreds of thousands of people is cripple what ISIS draws its strength from; destroy their infrastructure, hammer the electricity capacity of that city, destroy the bridges on their roads of ingress and egress, take away the oil refining installations that they possess and use to fund themselves with millions of dollars of illegal cash.

We have the ability to rebuild those later, but ISIS would be diminished deeply by their loss. The most humane thing we can do to protect civilians is defeat the barbarians, causing their

suffering. That is true humanity. If the United States leads, others will stand shoulder to shoulder. Mr. President, we need you to lead.

We hear talk about counterterrorism. Well, here is something every American can help with. News stations, stop putting ISIS recruiting videos as B-roll on your newscasts. Replace it with crosshairs and explosions of their defeat, or show the world their acts of barbarity, instead, for the B-roll. Stop using their images and their propaganda for furthering American newscasts. Americans, write your local news stations and tell them to stop it.

Iran, here is the cold reality and its impact on ISIS and Middle East unrest. Lifting sanctions on Iran will introduce tens of billions of dollars into these war-torn nations and will destabilize the entire region. Mr. President, do not lift the sanctions on Iran. They must show good action before we show good will.

Finally, we must go back to the drawing board on this so-called strategy of halfheartedness. Using American warriors should mean backing them with the full weight and might of this Republic.

Mr. President, do you not realize that our enemies hear you loud and clear when you say you will not sign the Defense Authorization? Secretary Carter, do you not realize that we are still negotiating it between both Houses of Congress? Why do you say you support a veto when we are still in the process of its negotiation? By such actions, one thing is certainly clear: nothing is too good for the troops, and nothing is what they will get.

Instead, lead, achieve, get an ISIS strategy worthy of this mighty Republic, sign the Defense Authorization, and let's get back to our constitutional requirement to provide for our Nation's defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

#### WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had an interesting vote today on the trade agreement, and I know my friends at Club for Growth have scored that.

They wanted people to vote "yes" because they believed, as some have said, it is about free trade; but it is a bit ironic for those who follow politics because, on the one hand, Republicans were being told this will allow us to force the President to keep us apprised, to give us notice of what is going on so that we can reign anything in that is not helpful to the country.

I didn't have that impression of the bill, not when reading the TPA, not

going to the classified setting. I mean, I did that; I read the TPP, most of it.

Having been a lawyer and a judge, prosecutor, done defense, a chief justice, I have litigated a lot of loopholes. There are a lot of loopholes in that TPP. There were loopholes in the TPA.

□ 1430

One of my Democratic friends was telling me, Mr. Speaker, that he was being told that the whole reason the President came up here is that, by passing this trade agreement, it is going to allow the President to get his agenda done in the next 18 months without Congress being able to stop him.

Some of my Democratic friends prefer that Congress have more say than that, and some were not happy with the proposal at all. They also were smart enough to know there are a lot of American jobs that will be lost because of that bill. I am not an isolationist. I believe in free trade, but I don't believe in free rein for a President. I am afraid that is what it will do, and that is why I had to vote "no" once again.

But it passed, and now, we will see if what some of my Democratic friends were told is accurate in that the bill will allow the President to achieve his agenda without Republicans being able to stop him. It appears that way to me, in reading the bills, that he has got enough loopholes he can take advantage of.

Plus, even without loopholes, there is a requirement of notification. He was required to notify us before he released anybody from Guantanamo. He didn't do it. He went ahead and released five of the worst murderers in return for a guy who is, we are told, about to be charged with desertion.

The President doesn't seem to be bogged down by having to follow the law, but I am impressed with my friends who think—but, yes—if we pass one more law that makes him give us notice, after 6½ years of his not keeping us apprised as the law requires, this time, we think he really, really will.

I am impressed with that kind of optimism, even though the old expression here in Washington is, no matter how cynical you get, it is never enough to catch up. Sometimes, I think there is merit to that.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there is an issue even far more important than trade that is about to hit this country. It could create a constitutional crisis of proportions that some of the Justices on the Supreme Court can't imagine. Mr. Speaker, I blew up the law. This is the law. It is not an ethical requirement.

I mean, having been a prosecutor, a defense—heck, I was even court-appointed to appeal a capital murder conviction. I don't know how many here on the floor have appealed a capital murder conviction. I begged the judge not to appoint me, but he did anyway, and when I got into the thousands of

pages of records, I found out he had not gotten a fair trial.

I fought for him in the highest court in Texas and got the death penalty reversed. Some clients felt like I was a pretty good lawyer. I was told before I went on the bench that I got the only jury verdict against what was then the largest oil company in the world. I don't know if it was or is. That is what I was told.

I know something about practicing law, and I know something about being a judge. I know that, with any case in which the public would suspect that I could not be impartial, I would have to recuse myself. Sometimes, judges will just recuse themselves so they don't have to make a tough call—I never did that—but there are times when you have such a strong opinion about a matter that you have no business sitting on that case.

Now, ethical requirements would insist that a judge conduct his performance as a judge in such a way that it comports with the requirements of the canons of ethics. However, this isn't an ethical violation that would get you a letter from some bar president or from somebody saying: We think you violated the canons of ethics.

This isn't it. This is United States law. This is the law of the land. This is part A. Part B goes into some different possibilities when a judge might have to recuse him or herself, but it is volume 28 of the United States Code, section 455, and section A doesn't have any subparts to it like B does. B is, like I say, other examples where the judge might have to recuse himself, but A is unequivocal.

"Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall"—that is a "shall"—"disqualify himself"—generic, male or female—"in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

This is not some model code of ethics. This is the United States law. No one in the country, including on the United States Supreme Court, is supposed to be above the law. As we have talked about, we have two Justices who have performed same-sex marriages.

In fact, the article by Greg Richter, May 18 of 2015, is quoting from Maureen Dowd in her article in which Maureen Dowd writes regarding Justice Ginsburg: "With a sly look and special emphasis on the word 'Constitution,' Justice Ginsburg said that she was pronouncing the two men married by the powers vested in her by the Constitution of the United States."

Now, there is no question that Justice Ginsburg is biased, prejudiced. She has her own opinion about this matter. She has had her opinion about this. That was clear in the first same-sex marriage she performed. For her not to disqualify herself is a violation of the law of the United States; yet we are told that Justice Ginsburg is not going to recuse herself, that she wants to be part of a majority opinion.

What happens when someone who is disqualified for sitting on a case sits on a case anyway in order to use her partial, biased position to bring about a majority opinion? It would certainly seem that that would be an illegal act, not criminal—this isn't criminal law—but it is an illegal act for someone to violate this law.

Then, of course, we also had Justice Kagan as mentioned in the fall of last year, in September of last year, in *The Hill*, when Peter Sullivan reported: "Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan officiated a same-sex wedding on Sunday," a court spokeswoman told the Associated Press.

"The ceremony in Maryland for a former law clerk is the first same-sex wedding that Kagan has performed. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and retired Justice Sandra Day O'Connor have performed same-sex weddings in the past.

"Gay marriage," the article reads, "has been a divisive topic at the Supreme Court as it has been elsewhere in the country."

The article reads: "The Court could decide as early as this month whether to take up the issue again in the coming session, this time to consider a more sweeping ruling declaring a right to same-sex marriage across the country.

"Ginsburg said last week that, unless an appeals court allows a gay marriage ban to stand, 'there is no need for us to rush' on a Supreme Court ruling."

But they took the case up, and now, we are told they are going to rule by June 30 of this month.

Clearly, Justice Kagan is disqualified. She has had a profound opinion. It reads "in which the impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

There are different standards of evidence in the law. Some States use different burdens of proof. You can have more likely than not if it is a group, like on a jury, one more than half. If there is a preponderance of the evidence that it is more likely than not, then you find that way.

Probable cause is an issue that has an evidentiary requirement. It has got to be, probably, something is likely or has occurred, a preponderance of the evidence. I mentioned that "beyond a reasonable doubt" is what most criminal courts have before you can find someone guilty. Evidence must be beyond a reasonable doubt. There are some courts that use a standard called "clear and convincing evidence."

This United States law doesn't use any of those standards. It is a very weak threshold before a judge or a Justice must disqualify himself. He must disqualify himself. I hated the fact that Justice Scalia, some years back, had to disqualify himself, but he had already had an opinion expressed about, I believe it was, the Pledge of Allegiance.

He could not be sure that it wouldn't end up as a 4-4 decision, which meant the ninth circuit decision would stand, which struck down "under God" in the

pledge, as I recall, but he disqualified himself. Justice Scalia followed 28 USC 455.

He disqualified himself because his judgment—his impartiality—might reasonably be questioned. It appeared that he was partial, that he had an opinion in the case, so he disqualified himself. That is acting in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I keep coming back to this. It is a matter of a constitutional crisis when the Highest Court in the land not merely strikes down and says that their opinion is more important than Moses', depicted up there in the center point of this room, more important than Moses', depicted in the marble wall over the Supreme Court, holding the Ten Commandments.

The Supreme Court says theirs is more important than the opinions established and stated by Jesus Christ when he said—and he was quoting Moses—that a man shall leave his mother and father, a woman leave her home, and the two will come together and be one flesh, and what God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

That is the law of God according to Moses. It is the law of God according to Jesus. It is tough enough if you have a United States Supreme Court which, back in the 1890s, said this is clearly a Christian nation. Despite what any opinions may be, the evidence established. This country was established as a Christian nation.

The great thing is that, if a nation is established on Judeo-Christian beliefs, it allows anybody to live here and to function here and to do so without impediment to one's beliefs because one can be an atheist, an agnostic, a Buddhist, a Muslim.

You can be any of those things, as long as you are not trying to take over the country like some would like to do.

□ 1445

But otherwise, by basing a country on Judeo-Christian beliefs, we have provided more freedom for individuals than any nation in the history of the world. And yet we may have an ultimate crisis here when a Court says our opinion is more important than God, if there is one, more important than Moses, more important than Jesus. Our opinion is not only more important than those people, but it is the law of the land, and it is so important that our opinion count that we are going to violate the law ourselves in order to force our opinion—clearly what it is—our opinion on the United States of America.

I don't want anybody to be prejudiced against anybody else. I was sick to my stomach this morning hearing about the shooting in Charleston, South Carolina. This evil perpetrator killed my brothers and sisters. We are brothers and sisters in Christ. Skin color does not matter one bit. He killed my brothers and sisters.

I hope America joins me in mourning. I know the people on both sides of

this aisle do. At our prayer breakfast this morning, we prayed and will continue to pray for the families of those who were lost. Those Christians, we as Christians believe, as Jesus told the thief beside him: This day you will be in paradise with Me. We believe they are better off than any of us here in the United States or on Earth.

Because of their beliefs, we believe they are in paradise with Jesus himself, with the Lord, but it is the terrible wake they leave behind that is so tragic. State senator, from all accounts a good man, not only a Christian brother, but a really good man, pastor. Three men, six women. So our hearts go out to them. We don't want anybody to be prejudiced against anybody.

But when it comes to the founding block, the foundation of any solid society, it doesn't matter what relationships exist. It doesn't matter who loves or is friends with whom. As a Christian, I think I can love most everybody. There are a few it is kind of tough, but most everybody. I have got some Democrats over here. I love them. They are just wonderful people. They are wrong on issues, but I love them. They are great folks. There is no animus.

But when it comes to the foundation of this Nation, the home, a mother and a father, regardless of what other relationships may exist between siblings, between anybody else, what matters is you don't destroy the central building block.

I was intrigued when the Iowa Supreme Court back in 2009 didn't use these words, but basically said there is no evidence in nature to indicate a preference of a marriage being between a man and a woman. It was clear the people of Iowa spoke—I love those folks. They were awesome. They came out, and for the first time since the up-or-down retention vote started, I understand, in 1960 or 1962 or so, they threw out the judges that were up for reelection because the vast majority in Iowa knew that is ridiculous.

Nature makes very clear that you start a family, whether you keep both a mother and father, things happen. There are so many of our greatest Americans have arisen from orphanages or from single-parent homes, but still it doesn't get away from the optimum being nature says you are best off if you have a mother and father. They can produce children. Yes, you can adopt children, sure, but that is where nature comes in and says, yeah, but the optimum is a mother and a father in a home.

I know there are some who are involved in same-sex marriage. They are not able to love as I do. They hate anybody that disagrees with them. There are some that can love me, though we disagree. I hope that the continued hatred that has been growing among some in the same-sex community can be tamped down, but this is an issue that is foundational to any society that is going to maintain strength,

going to maintain viability for a long time into the future rather than show we just crossed another milestone on our way to the dustbin of history. This is something that is important to our society, to our foundation. Let's love everybody. Let's use law enforcement to stop those like the evil perpetrator in Charleston, like the leftwinger I think it was in North Carolina that killed the Muslims. There is no call for that. The man needs to go to prison. In Texas, we would say it is a multiple murder. I would say you need to get the death penalty for killing more than one Muslim. There is no place for that.

But again, when it comes to the optimum home, a loving mother and father can procreate, adopt, but regardless of who agrees or disagrees, this is going to be a civilization changer, and it is not going to be for the better. We are going to continue our divisiveness and destructiveness when the highest Court in the land has Justices that say: My opinion is so much more important than the Bible, Moses, Jesus. My opinion is so much more valuable that I am going to violate the law; I am going to break the law so I can sit on this opinion, so the country can have my forced opinion on it.

I know there are Christian leaders, some are ready to capitulate, but there are some that won't. But we are now to the point, STEVE KING and I and some others, addressed back when the hate crime bill was being discussed, that we are going to lead to the point where you ultimately persecute, eventually prosecute people because of their beliefs about sexuality. People then were wrong because they couldn't see the future, but this is where we have come.

Now, if you hold the same beliefs that David Axelrod says the President didn't, but he said it in order to get elected, that a marriage is a man and a woman, you hold that belief that most Americans have held and still hold, that the Founders all held regardless of their sexuality, they believed a family, marriage at least, was a man and a woman, that that was foundational.

So I am not sure what is going to happen in this country. I don't have that kind of crystal ball. But I know if we have two or three Justices who are clearly disqualified, who have clearly indicated—not only raised questions as to whether they could be reasonably questioned as to their impartiality, they made clear they are very, very partial. I don't know what happens, but it isn't going to be good at all.

Justice Sotomayor has made statements that indicate she has an opinion before this case was decided. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope scholars will look carefully at this and they will understand, if Supreme Court Justices violate the law in order to change the law dramatically, as they want to do, is that a valid law? I don't believe it is. If they break the law in order to make the law, it is a void law. They need to recuse themselves and let an impartial group on the Court make the decision. It should be left to the States anyway.

It is probably sufficient grounds for impeachment for a Supreme Court Justice to violate the law so that they can force their will upon the American people to push through their legislative agenda even though they are not legislators. Probably impeachment would be in order. If they break the law in order to change dramatically the law, they shouldn't be on the Supreme Court.

It is my hope and prayer they will do the legal thing, recuse themselves before the Court makes its final decision with regard to marriage. If they don't, they will go down in legitimate American history books as being exceedingly destructive, and history will note that they violated the law in order to change the law so that it would be the way they wanted, not with a constitutional amendment, not through a legislative process, not by a constitutional convention that article V provides for. They just had the feeling that they wanted to tinker with over 200 years of law and foundational societal structure and force America to abide by their legislative agenda. Again, I just can't get over that.

If they don't disqualify themselves, they will violate the law to try to change the law with the agenda they have made clear that they have. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope Americans will join me in not only hoping, but praying that their hearts will be touched, that they will decide not to act illegally, that they will be moved toward acting lawfully, disqualify themselves, and let us get a proper opinion from the Supreme Court.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. JOLLY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 19, 2015, at noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1863. A letter from the Secretary, Office of the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Com-

mission's final rule — Proceedings before the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; Rules Relating to Suspension or Disbarment from Appearance and Practice (RIN: 3038-AE21) received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1864. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0106; FV15-925-2 FR] received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1865. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing ten officers on the enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1866. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Bruce E. Grooms, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1867. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Removal of Obsolete Provisions received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1868. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1869. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1870. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1871. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1872. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Designation of National Security Positions in the Competitive Service, and Related Matters (RIN: 3206-AM73) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2390. A bill to require a review of university-based centers for homeland security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-168, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1646. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to research how small and medium sized unmanned aerial systems could be used in an attack, how to prevent or mitigate the effects of such an attack, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 114-169 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALVERT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2822. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1646 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2390 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2818. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 2819. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to make certain provisions relating to health insurance inapplicable in a State that does not have an exchange established by the State under section 1311 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 2820. A bill to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform partnership audit rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2823. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ensure that juveniles adjudicated in Federal delinquency proceedings are not subject to solitary confinement while committed to juvenile facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 2824. A bill to provide whistleblower protections to certain workers in the offshore oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 2825. A bill to eliminate the offsetting accounts that are currently available for use by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BERA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 2826. A bill to establish the Commission on Government Transformation to make recommendations to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, of Federal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2827. A bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2828. A bill to amend titles 28 and 10, United States Code, to allow for certiorari review of certain cases denied relief or review by the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 2829. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, House Administration, Rules, Appropriations, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2830. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2831. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions classified to chapters 44, 45, 46, and 47 of title 50, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2832. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 52, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 2833. A bill to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2834. A bill to enact certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, "Environment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ZINKE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 2835. A bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 2836. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand the number of employers required to provide a reasonable time and place for employees to express milk at the workplace; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2837. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Pierre L'Enfant from the District of Columbia and to provide for the permanent display of the statue in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 2838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2839. A bill to reform and modernize domestic refugee resettlement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2840. A bill to prohibit any appropriation of funds for the Science and Technology account of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that eligible product developers have competitive access to approved drugs and licensed biological products, so as to enable eligible product developers to develop and test new products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify individual income tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. KILDEE):

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution supporting National Men's Health Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 326. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to reduce the influence of money in politics; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. SIREN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H. Res. 327. A resolution recognizing the three-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which permits young people who were brought to the United States by their parents as children to remain temporarily in the United States and make meaningful contributions to our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 328. A resolution commemorating the inaugural "International Yoga Day" on June 21; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 329. A resolution encouraging the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H. Res. 330. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Members of Congress should support and promote the respectful and dignified disposal of worn and tattered American flags; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H. Res. 331. A resolution expressing support for States to adopt "Racheal's Law"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Res. 332. A resolution recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

57. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4, urging Congress to enact legislation allowing individual states to establish daylight saving time as the standard time in their respective states throughout the calendar year; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

58. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 4, urging Congress to pass legislation that would better align 42 C.F.R. part 2 with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

59. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Resolution 15-003, supporting pregnancy resource centers in their unique contributions to the individual lives of women and men and of babies—both born and unborn; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

60. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 1422, urging the Congress and the President to pass and enact new economic sanctions against Iran should that nation be found to be in violation of the Joint Plan of Action or fail to reach an acceptable agreement by the dates set forth in the November 2014 extension of the Joint Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

61. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, Urging Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 19, urging the Secretary of Energy and Congress to support siting of United States Department of Energy's Frontier Observatory for Research in Geothermal Energy at the Newberry Geothermal Project; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

63. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 15-019, declaring March 23, 2015, to be "Colorado Aerospace Day"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

64. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 11, urging the Congress to support the mission of the Veterans Health Administration Office of Rural Health and efforts to improve access to health care for veterans in rural areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

65. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 9, urging the Congress to recognize the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure for United States veterans who served in the waters defined by the combat zone in Vietnam, and in the airspace over the combat zone; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

66. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Reso-

lution No. 141, urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to designate Grambling State University as a United States Department of Agriculture 1890 land-grant institution; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and the Workforce.

67. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 109, commending the United States Congress on the passage of bipartisan legislation to permanently set the payment amounts that Medicare pays for physician services, known as the doc fix; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, I, Section 8, Clause 1 (The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 2819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

"The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

This bill also makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 2821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 2822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United



States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause I of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power. . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 2823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 2824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4—To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 2827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 2829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions classified to chapters 44, 45, 46, and 47 of title 50, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 2832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 52, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 2833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 and 18, and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 2834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation, which maintains the United States Code by codifying Federal statutes, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation enacts certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, "Environment." Codifying Federal statutes is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the legislative branch of the United States.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 2835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 2836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 8 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TROTT, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. REED, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 154: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 167: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 282: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 288: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 292: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 320: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 347: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 358: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 465: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 540: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 556: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. HILL, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 578: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
 H.R. 600: Mr. NEAL.  
 H.R. 610: Mr. ROUZER.  
 H.R. 649: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 699: Mr. LUCAS.  
 H.R. 700: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 721: Mr. TONKO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 727: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 771: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.  
 H.R. 775: Mr. WELCH and Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 836: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 855: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 865: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 868: Mr. KIND.  
 H.R. 887: Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
 H.R. 911: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 913: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1019: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. AMODEI.  
 H.R. 1151: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 1197: Mr. FOSTER.  
 H.R. 1202: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
 H.R. 1220: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BERA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. Watson Coleman, and Mr. NUGENT.  
 H.R. 1233: Mr. PITTENGER.  
 H.R. 1270: Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
 H.R. 1282: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 1300: Mr. BENISHEK.  
 H.R. 1309: Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 1312: Mr. KIND and Mr. NOLAN.  
 H.R. 1321: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1360: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. BASS.  
 H.R. 1378: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 1388: Mr. LUCAS.  
 H.R. 1414: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 1427: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 1434: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.  
 H.R. 1460: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 1475: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 1516: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. JOLLY.  
 H.R. 1559: Mr. MACARTHUR.  
 H.R. 1581: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. WALZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
 H.R. 1595: Mr. KNIGHT.  
 H.R. 1598: Mr. HECK of Nevada.  
 H.R. 1610: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1613: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1644: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 1678: Mr. SHUSTER.  
 H.R. 1683: Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. FARR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. VEASEY.  
 H.R. 1684: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 1686: Mr. LYNCH.  
 H.R. 1688: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. NOLAN.  
 H.R. 1718: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
 H.R. 1739: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 1748: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. ESTY.  
 H.R. 1779: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 1784: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. RIGELL.  
 H.R. 1786: Mr. GUINTA.  
 H.R. 1804: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 1853: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
 H.R. 1877: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 1893: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
 H.R. 1919: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. BARLETTA.  
 H.R. 2016: Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 2046: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H.R. 2050: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 2059: Mr. DELANEY.  
 H.R. 2063: Ms. LEE and Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
 H.R. 2072: Mr. POCAN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 2125: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 2147: Ms. BASS.  
 H.R. 2217: Mr. MOULTON.  
 H.R. 2244: Mr. OLSON.  
 H.R. 2247: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. O'ROURKE.  
 H.R. 2259: Mr. GIBSON.  
 H.R. 2295: Mr. PERRY and Mr. WESTERMAN.  
 H.R. 2296: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H.R. 2302: Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 2341: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 2360: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 2379: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H.R. 2400: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.  
 H.R. 2404: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. VALADAO.  
 H.R. 2410: Mr. CLAY and Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
 H.R. 2417: Mr. BOUSTANY.  
 H.R. 2429: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 2461: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 2466: Mr. YOHIO and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 2510: Mr. TROTT.  
 H.R. 2520: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 2524: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2555: Mr. JONES.  
 H.R. 2571: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2576: Mr. SCHRADER and Ms. SCHKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 2620: Mr. GIBSON.  
 H.R. 2643: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 2647: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.  
 H.R. 2680: Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H.R. 2691: Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 2710: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 2716: Mr. HUDSON.  
 H.R. 2721: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. VEASEY.  
 H.R. 2734: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 2737: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 2738: Mr. VEASEY.  
 H.R. 2740: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 2745: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 2748: Ms. ESHOO.  
 H.R. 2750: Mr. KEATING.  
 H.R. 2761: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 2770: Mr. RICHMOND.  
 H.R. 2788: Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 2805: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 2817: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LONG.  
 H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H. Con. Res. 56: Ms. ESTY, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. LAMALFA.  
 H. Res. 54: Mr. HANNA.  
 H. Res. 112: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H. Res. 117: Mr. KILDEE.  
 H. Res. 130: Mr. TROTT.  
 H. Res. 214: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. DEUTCH.  
 H. Res. 230: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HILL, and Mr. COHEN.  
 H. Res. 259: Mr. HINOJOSA.  
 H. Res. 282: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H. Res. 286: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
 H. Res. 294: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 318: Mr. LANCE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. JOYCE.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

14. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Oakland County Board of Commissioners, Michigan, relative to miscellaneous resolution No. 15110, urging the Michigan Legislature to adopt legislation creating a sales and use tax exemption for the purchase of tested and approved firearms safety and storage devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.